THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

The Relation of Medieval Preaching Manuals to the Medieval English Morality Plays

A DISSERTATION
Submitted to the Faculty of The
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Of The Catholic University of America
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Marianne Grier Briscoe

Washington, D. C.
1975

XUM

This dissertation was approved by

E. Catherine Dunn as director
E. Catherine Dunn

and by William J Rooney and
William J. Rooney

Spenser J Cosmos as readers.
Spenser J. Cosmos

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

Part I: The *Artes Praedicandi*

Chapter I: The History of the *Ars Praedicandi*; State of the Question 9

Chapter II: Three Principles of Sermon Theory 57

Part II: Introduction; The Morality Plays and the *Ars Praedicandi* 97

Chapter III: The Use of Authority in the Morality Plays 105

Chapter IV: The Use of "Contraries" in the Morality Plays 142

Chapter V: The Use of Sermonic Voice in the Morality Plays 184

CONCLUSION 216

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED 219

XUM

INTRODUCTION

The fifteenth-century English morality plays are noteworthy for the similarity of their themes and styles. Few dramatic genres display such homogeneity. Much of the similarity of the four complete plays which comprise the genre is attributable to their common concern. Everyman, Mankind, Wisdom Who is Christ, and The Castel of Perseverance all discuss how a man may attain salvation and avoid the pitfalls which await him on the way to eternal bliss. Characters in the plays are symbolic in their names, actions, and characteristics; the plots invariably represent the protagonist, mankind, vascillating between a good and a sinful life. The plots show little concern for realistic episode or motivation (though in performance the plays were probably embellished with mundane props and by-play). Instead the plays try to exhort their audiences to eschew the evil temptations of the world for the bliss of salvation. That is, the primary characteristic of the fifteenth-century English morality play is its argumentative approach to the salvation of its spectators.

This dissertation examines the medieval sermon handbook (the ars praedicandi) as a possible contemporary, theoretical source for the English morality play. Since the objectives and subject matter of the English morality play and the medieval sermon are very similar, there is likelihood that the playwrights borrowed techniques from the preachers. There are also historical arguments which make it seem probable that the morality playwrights were clerics and therefore practising preachers. If this was the case, the playwrights would not simply have copied sermon practices which are summarized in the _artes praedicandi_; they would actually have studied the handbooks and first applied their teaching in the pulpit. The transfer of sermon technique to dramatic composition would have been simple and natural.

After discussing the background of the preaching manual, this study attempts to establish a bibliography of edited _artes praedicandi_. The textual and historical study concludes that the influence of printing in the later fifteenth century, and medieval scholars' frequent disregard for the integrity of a text made the influence of the _artes_ cumulative. That is, one cannot determine the effects of preaching theory upon a fifteenth-century English playwright by studying only the contemporary preaching manuals. Instead, one must study the entire European tradition of the preaching manual from its beginning around 1150 to the date of the last morality play, around 1475. The age or provenance of a treatise did not affect its value for a medieval scholar or student. In fact, many treatise writers began by copying one or more useful parts of older texts; they concluded with their own recommendations to the preacher.

Despite the possibility that the morality playwrights were trained preachers, it cannot be concluded that the English plays are merely dramatized sermons. Instead, the playwrights translated the basic assumptions of pulpit technique to the medieval stage. There is no continuous or comprehensive transfer of the parts or devices of the medieval sermon to the moralities.

A cursory examination of the treatises explains this phenemonon. The format of the handbook does not readily lend itself to dramatic composition. An ars praedicandi deals with a specific sermon type, the thematic sermon, which was popular in the later middle ages. For the most part the handbooks begin by discussing the selection of the sermon's opening statement, its theme or Scripture quotation, and then teach the art of preaching by progressing through the sermon part-by-part. The artes contain few generalizations about sermon theory; rather, they resemble the instructions which accompany a toy model ship or airplane. Each step is presented thoroughly, with copious illustration, but no overview of the process is attempted.

The morality plays are not thematic sermons, although they offer the same didactic arguments as the later medieval sermon. They are stage plays dependent upon dramatic action, and not merely on speech, to convey their argument. The resemblance between morality play and sermon technique is found in the devices which underlie the thematic sermon, not in the parts which comprise its outline. This study groups the devices of the thematic sermon under three general headings: authority, contraries, and sermonic voice. Handbook evidence for each will be presented. A thorough discussion of the presence and function of the three in the morality plays will form the second half of this dissertation.

It must be emphasized that this study views the English morality plays as argumentative, rhetorical constructs. The plays, though they may have poetic moments, are probably not intended to be beautiful objects fit for contemplation in themselves. Rather, they are useful and entertaining instruction in faith and morals. They deal in a straightforward manner with the pressing issue of fifteenth-century pastoral theology: how can a man be saved? For the most part, they address a lay audience with persuasive intentions. If the plays did not have ends similar to those of the sermons, the usefulness of the *artes praedicandi* in this study would be questionable. It could then be argued that sermonic devices simply pervaded the literary conciousness of fifteenth-century England and that the playwrights could have developed their dramatic techniques from the traditions of devotional poetry and prose. I do not believe that this is the case; instead, many sermon practices, which are continually discussed in the *artes*, are consistently applied in the plays. The English moralities are an assembly of argumentative, sermonic devices intended to persuade an audience to look to its salvation.

The relationship between thematic sermon technique, as represented by the *artes praedicandi*, and the technique of the fifteenth-century English morality play has never been studied. Indeed, I believe that the relationship between thematic sermon technique and that of any literary genre is unexplored. Some time ago A. C. Spearing proposed, but never pursued, such studies. Spearing's remark occurs in a series

XUM

of essays on Piers Plowman. He saw the lay public sermon as the literary form closest to Piers Plowman:

> [lay sermons] borrow from the ars praedicandi not a complete scheme but a general principle of structure: a method of organization by which a sermon, instead of depending on the "plot" of some Scriptural (or other) extract for its dispositio, becomes an independent meditation closely and constantly related to a single thema. And within this larger structure there will be an interweaving of sub-themes, involving frequent re-appearances of the same sets of words and ideas . . . . [here] we find forms of structure based on the recurrence, variation, transportation and re-creation of certain fundamental thematic material . . . . In this respect . . . the ars praedicandi provides a paradigm for any literature based on immutable revelation. The preacher or poet of Christian orthodoxy cannot leave us with an original message of his own; his aim must be to revitalize for us a commandment whose very familiarity may have deadened it as a motive for action.[1]

This passage actually spurred the present dissertation.

The only studies close to this undertaking are those of G.R. Owst. He surveyed medieval sermons and sermon handbooks and wrote a book entitled Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England,[2] which includes a chapter on the drama. But Owst's chapter rarely goes beyond examining the shared materials of the English sermons and English drama. Even when he deals directly with the artes praedicandi, his treatment of the handbooks is peculiarly limited to the sermon materials, not techniques, which they discuss. In Literature and Pulpit Owst notes only in passing that "purge and uplift" are the shared ends of the medieval sermon and drama (p. 471). Such observations are rare, however. More characteristic of Owst's treatment of the sermon-drama relationship is the conclusion to his discussion of the morality plays in the same book:

---

[1] A.C. Spearing, "The Art of Poetry," Criticism and Medieval Poetry (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1964), pp. 76-77.

[2] G.R. Owst, Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England (1933; 2nd ed., Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961).

> In scene after scene of the plays, we found it possible to trace each dominant idea in the preacher's mind, his view of the world as well as of religion, his little mannerisms and tricks of speech, his own tears and laughter, the peculiar inflections of his voice over some favourite tragedy or comedy of the Ars Praedicandi. Thus the expanded vernacular play itself often seems to be little more than a dramatized sermon or set of sermons. It is itself a product of the great homiletic revival of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Incessantly it derives fresh life and matter from its wider source of supply around it. (p. 547)

Despite Owst's important contributions to the field, the formal relationship of the sermon and the art of preaching to medieval morality drama remains unexplored.

It is easy to understand why studies like the present one have not been attempted. Ars praedicandi scholarship is sparse and chaotic. Few texts are edited and there is little assurance that the available texts adequately represent the handbook tradition. These and many other problems in ars praedicandi bibliography are discussed in subsequent chapters. This study of edited handbooks has been undertaken despite the uncertainty of the bibliography. There are some arguments that the available texts are indeed representative of the handbook tradition. It should be conceded, however, that studies in medieval rhetoric can never advance successfully without thorough inventories of the materials presently available. That is, in view of the textual problems, this dissertation can claim to be only a beginning in an exploration of the relationship between sermon technique and the morality play. But that beginning is important to research in medieval rhetoric and literary criticism.

Studies of this sort have not been attempted because literary critics have given little attention to the *ars praedicandi*. These manuals seem to be unique among medieval rhetorical and critical texts. The best known and most widely studied rhetorical treatises are *artes dictaminis* and *artes grammaticae*. They deal with the apt arrangement of words and phrases in writing--what classical rhetoricians called *elocutio*.[3] It is the *ars praedicandi* alone among medieval critical texts which explicitly avoids discussions of *elocutio* (sometimes referring the reader to other species of literary handbook). The preaching manual, which deals with the most complex rhetorical processes, the conception of an argument and the arrangement of parts, has received the least attention from textual scholars and literary critics. Despite its uncertain bibliographical state, the *ars praedicandi* is too important a rhetorical treatise for a student of morality drama to overlook.

---

[3] This point is discussed at length in J.W.H. Atkins, *English Literary Criticism: The Medieval Phase* (1943; rpt. Gloucester, Mass.: P. Smith, 1961), p. 100.

In the chapters which follow, I believe that some valuable insights into the dramatic technique of the English moralities have been discovered and put into a useful historical context through the study of the edited *artes praedicandi*. The dissertation begins with a general examination of the preaching manuals. More specific study of the handbooks, focusing on three devices, authority, contraries, and sermonic voice, follows. Part two of the dissertation examines the function of these three devices in the four complete English morality plays. The investigation reveals the surprisingly thorough technical interaction of two important late medieval literary forms.

PART I: The Artes Praedicandi

Chapter I: The History of the Ars Praedicandi: State of the Quesion

Ars praedicandi scholarship is most notable for two things: its scarcity and its general state of confusion. The following two chapters will attempt to survey modern studies of the artes and impose some order upon them. My own view of the issues in ars praedicandi study will surely create new controversy. Nonetheless, I believe that this survey not only presents the views of previous scholars on the preaching manual, especially in the era of the English morality plays, but also presents the handbook writers' views of their own endeavor. The final chapter on the handbooks will examine the texts themselves and discuss aspects of preaching theory which bear upon morality play techniques.

The problems treated in this chapter deal mostly with issues of classification. In drawing up a bibliography of edited artes praedicandi a definition of the term had to be developed. There are several classes of sermon manual, not all of which are artes praedicandi. The disorganized state of medieval rhetorical scholarship posed other complex bibliographical problems. Controversies over the origins of sermon theory are still unresolved. The relative influence of Greek and Roman rhetoric and logic had to be sorted out. The nature and impact of contemporary medieval influences on the preaching handbooks had to be weighed as well. Only then could a characterization of the handbook be attempted. The classification problems become most complex when the history of the handbook itself is considered. Some scholars see several distinct periods in the development of the ars. Some handbook writers themselves attempt to classify sermon styles. It is clear that no definitive organization of ars praedicandi history or species can be attempted at this time. Too few texts were studied for this dissertation; indeed, most scholars have seen very few artes. Nonetheless, surveys and controversies over the preaching manuals are informative and they give a good sense of the accepted knowledge in the field as well as a view of the many areas of uncertainty.

Throughout this study of the ars praedicandi and its scholarship the objectives of the present dissertation were kept in mind. That is, the artes are a means to gain insight into the dramatic techniques of the morality playwrights. In consequence, taxonomic problems in ars praedicandi history and scholarship are explored with a constant interest in their relevance to a characterization of popular sermon theory in fifteenth-century England. Problems and controversies which are not significant for these objectives are noted but not pursued as far as those which can illuminate the nature of sermon theory at the time of the moralities. Regrettably, a reader interested in a comprehensive examination of the ars praedicandi must await future developments in this area.

Any study of the artes praedicandi begins with a tremendous disadvantage. Like so many documents of medieval intellectual life a vast number of ars praedicandi manuscripts are unedited, uncatalogued, and probably even undiscovered. Prudence dictates that this dissertation be limited to study of the edited preaching handbooks. It would be impossible to select and examine an appropriate cross section of all extant examples of this textbook form. James J. Murphy, the most recent bibliographer of the ars praedicandi, notes that there are more than 300 handbook manuscripts identified today.[1] A good indication of the rapid growth of the handbook bibliography is the difference between Murphy's figure and the accounting offered by Harry Caplan in 1928-1929. At that time Caplan listed the initia of 183 unpublished ars praedicandi manuscripts, suspected the existence of another twenty-five and knew of fifteen more published in some form.[2] By 1933 Caplan knew of more than 250 extant sermon handbook manuscripts.[3] Murphy lists fifteen published tracts in his bibliography, although, without explanation, he claims that there are not "less than twenty-five" published tracts.[4] Since Caplan's last estimate in 1933 at least fifty more artes have been discovered, but only ten more editions have been attempted or, in the case of incunabula, recovered.

Controversies over authorship further complicate study of the ars praedicandi. Thomas-Marie Charland points out that the handbooks are generally anonymous and uncontroversial in content. Consequently, evidences of traceable doctrinal viewpoint or statements of authorship are unusual. In addition, the manuscript traditions are badly contaminated. Handbook writers and copyists saw the ars praedicandi as a practical treatise and often combined useful parts of very different handbook traditions with their own essays.[5] The result is that even among the treatises studied in this dissertation there is much overlapping of material and disputed dating and authorship.

---

[1] James J. Murphy, Medieval Rhetoric; A Select Bibliography (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971), p. 71.

[2] Harry Caplan, Medieval Artes Praedicandi; A Handlist, Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, vol. 24 (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1934), p. 2.

[3] Harry Caplan, "Classical Rhetoric and the Medieval Theory of Preaching," Classical Philology, 28 (1933), 80.

[4] Murphy, Medieval Rhetoric, p. 71.

These difficulties are less overwhelming than they might be. The following comparative study of handbooks and morality plays deals with the *ars praedicandi* as a general form only and restricts its focus to the *artes*' influence at the end of the period of handbook production. This dissertation can overlook many of the problems in *ars praedicandi* scholarship because it is interested only in the cumulative effects of the European preaching handbook tradition on the fifteenth-century morality playwrights in England. It is assumed that all edited handbooks dated prior to 1475 had influence on the general theory of preaching current in England in the morality play era. Those non-English handbooks exactly contemporary to the plays are presumed to be generally reflective of the current understanding of the preaching tradition. They supplement the evidence of the one fifteenth-century English *ars praedicandi* which has been edited (Simon Alcok's).

The assumption that the *artes* were widely disseminated and that they had impact continuing through as much as three hundred years is in part validated by library and manuscript studies. Alain of Lille's very popular *Summa de Arte Praedicatoria*, dated about 1198, exists today in eighty-nine complete manuscripts dating from the twelfth to the fifteenth

---

[5] Thomas-Marie Charland, "Les Auteurs d'artes praedicandi du XIII^{e} siècle," *Études d'Histoire Littéraire et Doctrinale du XIII^{e} Siècle*, première série (Paris: J. Vrin, 1932), pp.41-42.

XUM

century. Only forty-three of these manuscripts are dated in the thirteenth;[6] that is, more than half of the Summa manuscripts are fourteenth- and fifteenth-century copies. Gerald R. Owst notes a particularly plentiful supply of artes in medieval English libraries;[7] and J. E. Carver, writing in the New Catholic Encyclopedia, estimates that there are more than eighty manuscripts of about thirty distinct handbooks in English libraries today.[8] The use of the ars praedicandi in medieval England is explored in a scholarly controversy of some duration between J. J. Murphy and Richard Shoeck. Murphy contends that there was no instruction in rhetoric at Oxford prior to the early fifteenth century.[9] Shoeck insists that the ars praedicandi was taught at Oxford in the fourteenth century and that medieval preaching theory both relied upon and created a demand for rhetorical instruction in the universities.[10] No resolution of this controversy should be attempted here; but Murphy and Shoeck significantly agree that the ars praedicandi was part of the preparation of the fifteenth-century Oxford student. The inclusion of preaching study, if not actually in the curriculum (the crux of the controversy), at least as part of the skills the Oxford matriculant was expected to master, argues for an abundance of preaching theory materials and an attention to the ars praedicandi tradition in medieval England.

---

[6] Guy Raynaud de Lage, Alain de Lille; Poete du XII^{e} siècle. (Montreal: Institut d'Études Médiévales Albert-le-Grand, 1951), p. 35.

[7] Preaching in Medieval England (1926; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1965), p. 316.

[8] J. E. Carver, "Sermon Literature; English Medieval," in The New Catholic Encyclopedia, 13, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1967), 117.

[9] James J. Murphy, "Rhetoric in Fourteenth Century Oxford," Medium Aevum, 34 (1965), 12.

[10] Richard Shoeck, "On Rhetoric in Fourteenth Century Oxford," Medieval Studies, 30 (1968), 221.

Even the compilation of a bibliography of edited artes praedicandi is a difficult task. The most persistent problem, beyond the obvious one of simply gaining possession of the editions, deals with the definition of "ars praedicandi." There are many varieties of preaching handbook, all of which have been called artes by modern scholars. The handbooks must be divided into several distinct classes, however. General treatises on the nature of Christian rhetoric should be distinguished from conduct books for preachers, florilegia, and collections of sample sermons.

Augustine's De Doctrina Christiana is a treatise on Christian rhetoric. Book IV of this important work is sometimes called an ars. It certainly had profound influence on the later medieval preaching handbooks and was often referred to in these texts. Nevertheless, it is not an ars praedicandi. It does not deal explicitly with the rhetorical relationship between a preacher and his audience-congregation and it does not deal with the form and technical execution of a sermon. Nor does it regard the end of preaching as the communication of a particular kind of subject matter and point of view. That is, Augustine's topics are not strictly sermon invention, disposition, and elocution. Similar grounds for exclusion must be applied to Hrabanus Maurus' De Institutione Clericorum and Honorius Scholasticus' (Honorius of Autun) Speculum Ecclesiae. There

XUM

are valid arguments for calling all of these treatises artes praedicandi, especially Augustine's. Nonetheless, in the present dissertation the term refers to the distinctive medieval rhetorical handbook written after about 1175 which dealt with the thematic sermon.

The handbooks written prior to 1175 are not really artes praedicandi; it was Alain of Lille who first discussed (ca. 1198) the thematic or university sermon in its primitive stages. Nevertheless, Hugh of St. Victor (ob. 1141) and Guibert of Nogent (ob. 1124) are often considered the founders of secondary traditions in the history of the thematic preaching handbook. While they do not offer a part-by-part discussion of the thematic sermon, they do talk about writing such a work. Their viewpoints are helpful in understanding its technique and it is very likely that their work is contemporary with the practice of this form. It is probable that, like most theoretical treatises, the formal discussion of the thematic sermon postdated its actual development and use. Guibert's and Hugh's treatises are therefore included in this ars praedicandi bibliography.

The three remaining categories, conduct books, sermon collections, and florilegia, present greater taxonomic problems. Few of the handbooks written between 1200 and 1500 deal with preaching in exclusively rhetorical terms. There is a strong "conduct book" tradition which begins with Hugh of St. Victor. The term "conduct book" is a coinage of the present writer. It refers to the medieval application of the "vir bonus" tradition in Roman oratorical theory. Cicero and Quintilian stressed that a speaker must project an impeccable ethical image to be effective. The sermon theorists were similarly concerned about the spiritual and ethical conduct of preachers. Successful instruction in faith and morals required a credible speaker in the pulpit. Consequently, the treatises sometimes go into great detail on the proper conduct for preachers. Further, most handbooks contain numerous examples of the preaching devices discussed and many mingle rhetorical instruction with complete outlines of sample sermons. Some even include large sermon collections at the end. Conduct books are an important part of the later *ars praedicandi* tradition, and are included in the present bibliography. Those sermon collections which contain discussions of preaching theory are also included in the present study. *Florilegia*, however, are not considered. Most handbook authors refrain from collecting the sample themes, prothemes, exempla, anecdotes, etc., which fill *florilegia*; instead they refer the preacher to these aids.

The generally poor quality of the available *ars praedicandi* editions poses another bibliographical problem. The venerable *Patrologia Latina* is the sole source for several of the texts in this bibliography. Migne's compilation of texts has been subjected to many years of examination and the text of Alain's *Summa*, especially, is now in low esteem.[11] It is, however, the only modern printed edition of the treatise. In addition, not all texts are available in Latin editions; for example,

---

[11] Marie-Therise D'Alverny, *Alain de Lille: Textes inédits* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1965), p.110, n. 3.

Harry Caplan has supplied only an English translation of "Pseudo-Aquinas' " text. Not all texts are complete editions of their manuscripts (e.g., Woodburn O. Ross transcribes but one chapter of Jean of Galles's handbook). Translation projects on the available *artes praedicandi* are also affecting the handbook bibliography. In 1971 J. J. Murphy published an English translation of Robert of Basevorn's treatise done by Leopold Krul. It is to be hoped that Ernest Gallo's recently announced *ars praedicandi* translation and editing project will also fill some of the lacunae in the *ars praedicandi* bibliography.[12] Caplan and Murphy occasionally disagree on ascriptions and dating of manuscripts. In addition, there are errors and omissions in Murphy's bibliography, some of which I believe are corrected in my own bibliography. Each entry in the following bibliography is cross-referenced to Caplan's (C prefix) and Murphy's (M prefix) numbered entries; the list describes the texts and editions used in the ensuing study of the *artes praedicandi*.

---

[12] Correspondence with Prof. Gallo indicates that his publication schedule has been pushed far back from Fall, 1973. He announced these dates in L. L. Gioia, "Bibliography of Editions and Translations of Medieval Texts in Progress," *Speculum*, 48 (1973), pp. 191-92.

DESCRIPTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY: Edited *Artes Praedicandi*

1. Guibert of Nogent, ob. 1124. *Quo Ordine Sermo Fiere Debeat*, ed. F. Lucas d'Achery, in Migne *Patrologia Latina*, 156, cols. 21-32. English translation: "A Book about the Way a Sermon Ought to be Given," trans. Joseph M. Miller in Joseph M. Miller *et al.*, *Readings in Medieval Rhetoric*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973, pp. 162-181. Translation reprinted from *Today's Speech*,17 (November, 1969). French provenance, c. 4600 words.

C: 221, M: P46

2. Hugh of St. Victor, ob. 1141. *De Institutione Novitiorum*, ed. at Abbey of St. Victor in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, 176, Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, cols. 925-952. French provenance, c. 11,350 words.

M: P50

3. Alain of Lille, ob. 1203. *Summa de Arte Praedicatoria*, ed. D. Caroli de Wisch in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, 210,Paris: Migne, 1855 cols. 111-198. French provenance, c. 8600 words. Partial translation: J. Miller and Thomas Extejt in J. M. Miller, *et al.*, *Readings in Medieval Rhetoric*, pp. 222-227.

C: 215, M: P42

4. William of Auvergne (a fifteenth-century edition is attributed to Albert the Great, hence "Pseudo-Albertus Magnus;" portions of this text are also attributed to Richard of Thetford--see #6 below), fl. 1228-1249. *De Faciebus Mundi*, ed. A. de Poorter, *Revue Néoscholastique de Philosophie*, 25 (1923), 192-209. French provenance, though Richard of Thetford attributions claim English authorship, c. 4700 words.

C: 229

5. Humbert of Romans, ob. 1278. Treatise on Preaching (*De Eruditione Praedicatorum*), trans. (from a French language text) The Dominican Students, Province of St. Joseph; ed. Walter M. Conlon. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1951. French provenance, c. 544,000 words.

C: 224, M: P51

6. Pseudo-Bonaventure (Part 3 of this treatise attributed to Richard of Thetford), 13th century. *Ars Concionandi*, ed. Quaracchi Brothers in *S. Bonaventura Opera Omnia*, 9. Rome: Quaracchi, 1882-1902, pp. 8-21. French and disputed English provenance, c. 12,400 words.

C: 218, M: P43

XUM

7. Jean of Galles (also called John of Gaul, John of Wales, and Thomas of Galles) ob. 1302. *Forma Praedicandi*, ed. Woodburn O. Ross, "A Brief *Forma Praedicandi*," *Modern Philology*, 34 (1937), 337-344. English provenance, c. 700 words. One chapter of a larger unedited work.

C: 226.

8. Robert of Basevorn, fl. 1322. *Forma Praedicandi*, ed. T.-M. Charland, *Artes Praedicandi*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1936, pp. 229-323. English translation of Charland text in James J. Murphy, *Three Medieval Rhetorical Arts*. Berkeley: U. California Press, 1971, pp. 109-217. Trans. Leopold Krul. English (Oxford) provenance, c. 31,000 words.

C: 116, M: P53, P54.

9. Thomas Waleys, ob. 1350. *De Modo Componendi Sermones*, ed. T.-M. Charland. *Artes Praedicandi*, pp. 328-403. English (Oxford) provenance, c. 23,000 words.

C: 32, 160; M: P57.

10. "Henry of Hesse" (disputed attribution to Henry of Langenstein), ob. 1397. *Tractatus Eximii Doctoris Henrici de Hassia de Arte Praedicandi Valde Utilis*, ed. Harry Caplan, "'Henry of Hesse' on the Art of Preaching," PMLA, 48 (1933), 340-361. Latin text with English translation. German provenance, c. 2800 words. Some scholars dispute Caplan's attribution and date this treatise in the fifteenth century.

C: 222, M: P47.

11. Thomas of Todi, fl. late 14th century. *Ars Sermoniciandi ac etiam Collationes Faciendi*, trans. J. Miller in J. Miller, *et al*., eds. *Readings in Medieval Rhetoric*, pp. 273-9. Selections in English translation. French provenance.

M: P56.

12. Francesc Eiximenis, ob. 1409. *Ars Praedicandi Populo*, ed. Marti de Barcelona, "L'*Ars Praedicandi* de Francesc Eiximenis," *Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia*, 12 (1936), 301-340. Spanish provenance, c. 15,500 words.

M: P45.

13. Simon Alcok, ob. 1459. *De Modo Dividendi Thema pro Materia Sermonis Dilatanda* (*Tractatus Alcok de Divisione Thematis*), ed. Mary F. Boynton, "Simon Alcok on Expanding the Sermon," *Harvard Theological Review*, 34 (1941), 201-216. English (Oxford/Lincoln) provenance, c. 5,400 words.

XUM

14. Martin of Cordova (Martinus Alphonsus), fl. 1476. *Ars Praedicandi,* ed. Fernando Rubio, "'Ars Praedicandi' de Fray Martin de Cordoba," *La Ciudad de Dios,* 172 (1959), 327-48. Spanish provenance, c. 4,300 words.

M: P52.

15. Pseudo-Aquinas, 15th century (*incunabulum*). *A Brief Religious Tract on the Art and True Method of Preaching,* trans. Harry Caplan "A Late Medieval Tractate on Preaching," in *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of J. A. Winans,* A. M. Drummond, ed. New York: Century Co., 1925, pp. 61-90. Reprinted in *Of Eloquence: Studies in Ancient and Medieval Rhetoric,* eds. Anne King and Helen North. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970, pp. 48-76. Provenance uncertain, c. 7,000 words.

C: 217.

16. Christian Borgsleben of Erfurt, fl. 1475. *Ars Praedicandi Doct. Eximii Cristiani Borgsslebensis Erfordensis,* ed. Georg Buchwald, *Franziskanische Studien,* 8 (1921), 68-74. German provenance, c. 2,400 words. This is a manuscript, not an *incunabulum*.

M: P44.

XUM

One of the most important debates in the study of the *ars praedicandi* concerns the origins of the form. As in most such controversies the proposed *ars* sources vary according to the scholar's conception of what a typical preaching Handbook is. It has already been noted that the *ars praedicandi* did not take on recognizable form until Alain of Lille's *Summa*, written about 1198. Further, the handbook form was not fully developed until the thirteenth century. Many scholars link the emergence of the thematic sermon handbooks with the dominance of Scholastic philosophy and disputative methods in the newly vigorous universities. They view the thematic sermon as rhetoricized disputation. Others argue that the mendicant orders, their own origins linked to the flourishing of the universities, were responsible for the sudden development of the *ars*.[13] The new orders placed great stress on preaching and therefore required sermon textbooks. Regardless of the handbook's origin, it is fairly certain that the sermon manual did not precede the emergence of the thematic sermon itself. The evidence of a treatise such as Guibert of Nogent's (ca. 1120) argues that this sermon form was practised well before Alain of Lille summarized it in his treatise.

The most difficult controversy in the history of the manuals concerns the comparative influence of Aristotle and the tradition of Roman rhetoric. The handbooks reflect a familiarity with classical rhetorical and logical thought; scholars argue whether Greek or Roman traditions dominated sermon theory. Historians of medieval rhetoric point out that Aristotle's

---

[13] Albert Lecoy de la Marche, *La Chaire française au moyen âge* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1886), p. 265.

XUM

Rhetoric was not known to the Middle Ages until the thirteenth century and that throughout the period it was regarded solely as a text on ethics. The Rhetoric is not quoted directly in an ars praedicandi until 1502 in Johannes Ulrich Surgant's Manuale Curatorum.[14] Instead, Aristotle's influence on medieval thought came through the logical works, mainly the Topics and Categories. In addition, Quintilian's complete Institutio Oratoria is not known until its rediscovery by Poggio in 1416.[15] According to Harry Caplan, the medieval rhetorician's library held only Aristotle's Categories and Topics, Cicero's De Inventione, De Oratore, and "Rhetorica Nova" (the medieval title for the Pseudo-Ciceronian Rhetorica ad Herennium), Horace's Ars Poetica, and Boethius' De Differentiis Topicis and his commentaries on Aristotle's Categories and Topics.[16]

From these and later medieval resources Murphy discerns four separate traditions of rhetoric influencing the ars praedicandi and the English rhetorical tradition: the Aristotelian-logical, the Ciceronian-preceptive, the Grammatical (beginning with Horace) and the Sophistic (for which Seneca the Elder's Declamationes, a favorite source for medieval exempla, is the basic source).[17] Presumably originating with Cicero, the "preceptive tradition" of rhetoric is the one which Murphy regards as the primary influence on the preaching handbook. Augustine affirmed the preceptive tradition for the Middle Ages. According to Murphy this tradition assumes that a speech can be analyzed, or broken into parts or movements. Cicero divides speeches into several parts beginning with the exordium and ending with the peroration. The artes begin the sermon with a theme, discuss several discrete central parts, and end the sermon with a prayer. The preceptive tradition also argues that precepts or principles can be drawn from a speech which will inform future discourse or action. Such an instructive view of oratory was naturally suited to Christian preaching.[18]

---

[14] Harry Caplan, "Classical Rhetoric . . .", p. 96.

[15] Murphy sets 1416 as the terminal date for medieval rhetoric. The date is inconvenient for this study, which extends to the third quarter of the fifteenth century; it is also not a realistic one. 1416 probably did mark the end of medieval rhetoric for Poggio and his circle, but the impact of the rediscovery of Quintilian was certainly slow to touch the fifteenth century English readers of the ars praedicandi. James J. Murphy, "Modern Elements in Medieval Rhetoric," Western Speech, 28 (1964), 206, n. 1.

[16] Caplan, "Classical Rhetoric . . .," p. 95.

While Murphy's desire to create distinct rhetorical traditions for fourteenth-century Oxford seems questionable, his major point, that the Aristotelian logical tradition does not dominate medieval English rhetorical study or the ars praedicandi, is an important one. This opinion opposes the arguments of Harry Caplan, C. S. Baldwin, Richard McKeon, and Mary Boynton. The conflict seems, to this writer, to reflect the bibliographical problem of the handbooks which was discussed above. Baldwin and McKeon are attempting overviews of medieval rhetoric. The ars

---

[17] Murphy, "Rhetoric in Fourteenth . . .," pp. 2-3.

[18] Shoeck vigorously disputes Murphy's fragmentation of the medieval rhetorical heritage. He stresses instead the continuity of medieval rhetoric and favors Boethius's Topica (hence Aristotelian logical tradition) as the major rhetorical text at Oxford. Shoeck, p. 216, p. 221.

XUM

praedicandi is merely a passing consideration in their treatments. On the other hand, Caplan and Boynton have done close study of specific, lesser known handbooks generally dated after the thirteenth century. Only Caplan, prior to Murphy, has attempted a study of the preaching handbook tradition with a special interest in its classical origins. Murphy's study followed Caplan's work by approximately forty years and he had many more texts available. There are handbooks which show so much preoccupation with rhetorical topoi and categories (generally classed as dilatationes in the manuals) that their entire inspiration seems attributable to the logical traditions of Aristotle and Boethius. Boynton's edition of Alcok's work provides an extreme example of such an "Aristotelian" treatise. But the fuller view of the handbook tradition available today shows the considerable influence of the "preceptive tradition" of Ciceronian rhetoric as well as the concern of Cicero for the moral argument conveyed by the speaker's person, the formal parts of the speech, and the rapport of the speaker with his audience. While treatises as early as the thirteenth century show a healthy influence of Aristotelian-Boethian logic in their own structure and in the advice they offer for the composition of sermons, works written throughout the Middle Ages seem founded mostly upon the Ciceronian tradition. Of course, this tradition in its own right bears evidence of Aristotelian rhetorical and logical influence.

Contemporary conditions were just as influential as classical traditions in the design of the preaching handbooks. From the tenth century on there are repeated papal decrees deploring the state of preaching and commanding that sermons be preached in the vernacular or that they be given more often. At the beginning of the handbook era, 1215, Innocent III issues such a decree at the Fourth Lateran Council.[19]

The handbooks often proclaim that they will attempt to rectify the low state of preaching and begin by urging preachers to study Scripture and theology diligently. Alain of Lille, in a sample sermon included in his Summa, deplores the unwillingness of contemporary preachers to learn:

> Si ad aliquam lectionem accedis, non eam in momento relinquas, sed ei fideliter adhaereas, nec quasi fastidiens ad aliam transeas . . . . Nec dedignetur major a minore discere, quia aliquando revelatur minori, quod non majori . . . . Descendit enim aqua per canales lapideos, in areolas aromatum. Plato gentilis, multas passus tempestates, descendit in Aegyptum ut Genesim legeret; et Christianus dedignatur quod praesens est, quod appositum et parabile, quod ipsum instrueret. Clerici namque nostri temporis potius sequuntur scholas Antichristi, quam Christi, potius dediti gulae quam glossae; potius colligunt libras quam legant libros . . . .[20]

Later, leaving the sample sermon format and returning to straightforward advice, Alain launches an attack on the unlearned preacher:

> Ad praedicatores pertinet scientia, ut sint exercitati in utroque Testamento, et sententiarum examine discreti, in sermonibus facundi, in omnibus actibus suis circumspecti, contemptores mundi, in officio suo assidui . . . . Est autem quaedam ignorantia affectata, quando aliquis potest scire et non vult, haec est crassa et supina, et vincibilis, et ideo inexcusabilis . . . . Haec ignorantia pertinet ad praelatos, qui ex contemptu labuntur in ignorantiam; ex superbia remanent in insipientia: sine ratione presbyteri et prophetae; praeceptores impossibilium, indices occultorum.

---

[19] Charles-Joseph Hefele, H. Leclercq, Histoire des Conciles, vol. 5, pt. 2 (Paris: LeTouzey et Ané, 1913), Cann. 9-10, pp. 1339-1340.

[20] Alain of Lille, Summa de Arte Praedicatoria in Migne, Patrologia Latina, 210, col. 180.

XUM

> O vilis ignorantia, abominabilis insipientia, quae praelato imponit silentium, canem nostrum, id est pastorem, reddit mutum, haec est calamites, quae in os canis projecta, aufert latratum. Praelati nostri temporis prius sedent in cathedra, quam erudiantur sub ferula; prius suscipiunt honorem magisterii, quam sustineant onus discipuli. Isti volunt praesse, non prodesse, pretium honoris, non pondus oneris. Praelato tali potest dici: Medice, cura te ipsum (Luc. iv); orator pro te ipso allega; tu qui es vicarius Christi, imitare ipsius opus, qui coepit facere et docere (Act. i).[21]

Similar, less vigorous criticisms of untutored and lazy preachers can be found in Humbert of Romans' treatise. Humbert also offers several long treatments of the need for learning and spiritual wisdom on the part of preachers.[22] Later writers take a more practical view of the low state of preaching which has required them to produce their handbooks. Like Humbert they console the preacher on the difficulty of his task; then they offer him aids which they believe will benefit him. Later handbooks show more openly expressed humility and less disdain for the unskilled preacher who needs a handbook to guide him.

The thirteenth-century emergence of active, well-received mendicant orders whose primary vocation was preaching is a second contemporary influence on the ars praedicandi. The Ciceronian insistence on a morally credible speaker had been given ample expression in the Cistercian Alain's treatise and was reflected in the works of Guibert of Nogent and Hugh of

---

[21] Alain of Lille, cols. 183-84.

[22] Humbert of Romans, Treatise on Preaching, trans. The Dominican Students, Province of St. Joseph, ed. W. M. Conlon (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1951), p. 30, pp. 38-41.

St. Victor. Nonetheless, the emergence of a fully realized conduct book in the preaching tradition had to await the De Eruditione Praedicatorum of Humbert of Romans in the mid-thirteenth century. Humbert, the first general of the Dominican Order, probably wrote the order's first art of preaching. The text is not really a treatise on the thematic sermon. Rather, it touches on the whole of Dominican life, devoting special attention to mendicancy. There are even discussions and examples of how the Dominican can converse freely and sensibly with, e.g., "inferiors, simple souls and lay people" (pp. 127ff.). It is Humbert's extraordinary treatise which thoroughly melds the act of preaching and righteous living in the handbook tradition. From Humbert's time on Alain of Lille's admonition," . . . duo pertinet, doctrina et vita: doctrina ut alios instruant; vita, ut aliis bene vivendi exemplum praebeant,"[23] is repeated or discussed in some manner in every preaching handbook. Indeed, the mendicant influence is so great in this regard that after Humbert the preaching handbooks must be said to have two components. To the expected discussion of sermon form and technique is added a preacher's conduct book. The conduct book, though established as part of the ars by Humbert, clearly draws on the strong ethical ("vir bonus") tradition in Ciceronian rhetoric.

The mendicant orders also influenced the preaching tradition in several other ways. It was the friars who began to realize the desires of the papacy for frequent vernacular preaching to the laity. In addition, after 1300 almost all artes were written by Dominicans and Franciscans. Further, Shoeck speculates that in England the ars texts were generally kept and studied at the houses of friars near Oxford.[24] As has been discussed, there is disagreement over the role of the preaching manuals in medieval university curricula. Nonetheless, the university, if only because it, too, was dominated by the mendicant orders after 1300, had profound influence on the character and development of the sermon handbook. Much of the method of the thematic sermon shows the influence of the universities.

---

[23] Alain of Lille, col. 182.

The currency of Aristotelian logical principles in medieval thought was paced to the development and domination of scholastic methods of disputation at the universities. Those Aristotelian traits incorporated in the handbooks are a result of the "rediscovery" of Aristotle's logical works by the twelfth- and thirteenth-century masters of theology at Paris. In fact, Charland believes that the flourishing of the handbook follows the university movement itself through Europe. Not only was handbook content influenced by the university, but the very need for the treatises was linked to the flourishing of the universities. Hence the greatest handbook production, like the greatest university activity, occurs in France in the thirteenth century, in England in the fourteenth and in Germany in the fifteenth century.[25] Since the character of university intellectual life changed through these centuries, the handbooks show some differences attributable to the rise, decline, and replacement of Scholastic thought and methodology in the schools. If Charland's assessment of handbook development is correct, the bibliography of artes used for this study must be fairly representative of the handbook form. The provenance and dating of the texts in the bibliography roughly correspond to the development Charland proposes.

---

[24] Shoeck, p. 221.

[25] Thomas-Marie Charland, Artes Praedicandi: Contribution á l'histoire de la rhetorique au moyen âge, Publications de l'Institut d'Études Médiévales d'Ottawa, 7 (Paris: J. Vrin, 1936), p. 110.

Rather than attempt to pinpoint the differences between individual artes, it will be more profitable to seek out the common characteristics which the texts share. Most notably, all handbook authors insist that the sermon be useful or profitable for the audience. They require that the spiritual and moral objectives of the sermon be achieved through delight and instruction. As Murphy has noted, much of this prescription echoes the principles of Roman rhetoric, but the medieval preacher understands that he must instruct and move his audience to moral dispositions, not to issues of fact or truth. The milieu of the medieval sermon does not entertain dispute over the credibility of the truths it teaches. Their source is Scripture and the Church's traditional teaching; and the end of their rhetoric is the salvation of the congregation. The preacher's task is to move the audience by means of instruction and delight to heed the truths of his sermon, to love God, and to seek salvation. Simply to persuade is not enough for the medieval preacher; he must motivate, as well.

Alain of Lille, borrowing from Horace, summarizes this view in his seminal definition of preaching. Answering the question, "Quid est praedicatio?" Alain declares, "Praedicatio est, manifesta et publica instructio morum et fidei, informationi hominum deserviens, ex rationum semita, et auctoritatum fonte proveniens."[26] Elsewhere Alain repeatedly describes the function of the sermon in terms which stress the useful dimensions of preaching: "In sententiis vero debet habere praedicatio pondus, ut virtute sententiarum animos auditorum emolliat excitet mentem, pariat contritionem, compluat doctrinis, tonet minis, blandiatur promissis, et ita tota tendat ad utilitatem proximorum."[27] These passages are paraphrased throughout the history of the handbook and Alain's great stress on the useful aspect of preaching persists even in the most elaborate sermon theories of the fourteenth century. Alain's two statements on preaching are joined in a lengthy discussion of the nature of preaching in Humbert of Romans' treatise: "And it is to be noted that these three effects of preaching (understanding, pleasure and emotion) correspond to three faculties of our heart."[28] Humbert explains that these three faculties are knowledge, advice-seeking, and desire to do good.[29] Pseudo-Bonaventure elaborates on the answer to "Quid est praedicatio?" with a scheme which combines the objectives and modes of address of the sermon with the three main techniques of sermon development, division, distinction, and dilation.

---

[26] Alain of Lille, col. 111.

[27] Alain of Lille, col. 113.

[28] Humbert of Romans, p. 101.

[29] Humbert of Romans, pp. 102-103.

He has ingeniously linked the main themes of the handbooks. The passage occurs in the first paragraph of the text ("*Proemium*"):

> Fertur autem [of sermon making] studium maxime circa tria, scilicet circa *divisiones*, *distinctiones* et *dilatationes* sive progressus. Sed in primo, scilicet in dividendo, est attendenda *proprietas*, in distinguendo *brevitas*, in dilatando *utilitas*; sicut dicit Augustinus in eodem: "De his doctor debet esse sollicitus, ut scilicet *doceat*, ut *delectet*, ut *flectat*; quia docere, inquit, necessitatis est, delectare suavitatis, sed flectere victoriae." Sic itaque plerumque contingit, ut, dum est divisio *propria*, instruat; *brevis* distinctio delectet; dilatatio vero *utilis* flectat.[30]

Later descriptions of preaching continue to build on this base derived from Augustine and Cicero. Those modifications which do occur generally focus on the sermon's subject matter and its desired effect on the audience. Martin of Cordova supplies a good summarizing example of later approaches: "sermo est oratio informatiua ex ore predicatoris emissa, ut instruat fideles quid credere, quid agere, quid cauere, quid timere, quid sperare debeant."[31]

Just as the notion of preaching and the rhetorical intent of the sermon remain constant in the handbooks, so does the notion of the preacher's role. All handbooks remark that the preacher must confront his congregation with an aura of personal dignity and that to achieve this *ethos* the preacher must take up a worthy sermon subject, avoid *ad hominem* arguments, never be suspected of preaching for money, and speak in a prepared and decorous

---

[30] Pseudo-Bonaventure, *Ars Concionandi* in *S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia*, 9, ed. Quaracchi Brothers (Rome: Quaracchi Brothers, 1882-1902), p. 8.

[31] Martin of Cordova, *Ars Praedicandi*, ed. Fernando Rubio, "Ars Praedicandi," *La Ciudad de Dios*, 172 (1959), 330.

XUM

manner (the source of most handbook strictures against verbal ornament and verbosity). With the appearance of the conduct book as part of the ars praedicandi, the notion that the preacher's dignity is dependent upon his deportment both in and out of the pulpit pervades the handbook tradition. As has been noted, the preacher's credibility is, from Humbert forward, a necessary topic for even the most cursory and superficial handbooks.

Finally, the sermon structure presented by the handbooks is surprisingly uniform. All speak of a sermon opening with a Scripture text for a theme. This theme is the sermon's topic. A protheme (a second quotation) follows which functions either as a digression from the topic (of the sort sometimes used in classical oratory) or as a means of justifying the sermon topic. The theme is then divided into parts, generally three, and each part is explained or interpreted. Distinction and dilation are the terms used by the handbooks to indicate the various categories of devices used by preachers to expand the division.

The thematic or university sermon, as this preaching form is called, is a creation of the High Middle Ages. Although the basics of this sermon theory vary little in the period 1200 to 1500, there are, nonetheless, significant changes in its application and interpretation. One major development, the late arrival of the conduct book tradition, has already been considered. It should be noted that this new tradition does not actually alter the handbook form; it merely intensifies tendencies already present. Other changes have more radical effects on the ars praedicandi.

The only thorough consideration of the history of the ars praedicandi is Dorothea Roth's Die mittelalterliche Predigttheorie (Basel, 1956). The author attempts to discuss changes in the handbooks by dividing them into seven distinct periods. The periods are the Patristic (Augustine and Gregory); Eleventh and Twelfth Century Forerunners of Preaching Theory (Alain of Lille and Guibert of Nogent); Thirteenth Century (William of Auvergne and Humbert of Romans); Fourteenth Century Dominican Books (Jacques of Fusignano and Thomas Waleys); and Fifteenth Century Reaction against the Scholastic Artes (Mauritius of Leyden). Roth's seventh period considers the sixteenth-century handbook of Johannes Ulrich Surgant. This text postdates the morality plays and, though for Roth it is the synthesis of all prior preaching theory, it is not within the scope of the present study.

Roth's periodization serves to point out some of the major differences between artes of different dates. Unfortunately, some of the treatises she considered were not available for this study and several of the handbooks in the bibliography of the present dissertation were not considered by her. Nevertheless, her overview of handbook history is sound and comprehensive and it serves as a valuable foundation for my study. Roth reminds us that Augustine was largely responsible for incorporating Ciceronian rhetorical traditions into Christian oratory; he effectively assured the propriety of using profane learning in a Christian context. Most important for the ars praedicandi, Augustine applied the Roman rhetorical distinction between inventio and elocutio, or as Roth interprets it, substance and presentation, to the drafting of sermons.[32] The distinction is a valuable one because the preaching handbooks are the only body of medieval rhetorical texts which consistently deal with *inventio*; most books deal only with *elocutio*. More specifically, Book IV of Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana* established the practice of explaining Scripture with other Scriptural passages. Concordance, as this device is called, became the single most important preaching tool in the thematic sermon. In addition, Augustine's *cognitio rerum*, an analytical tool used in Biblical exegesis, developed into the *similitudines*, *proprietates rerum*, or *distinctio* of later handbooks.[33] The final contribution of the Patristic era was the initiation of the conduct book tradition in Gregory's *Regula Pastoralis*. Gregory provided a late sixth-century consideration of the role of preacher-priest in a Christian society and, like his successors, urges the preacher to compile a sample book of sermons classified according to the character of the audience.[34]

Guibert of Nogent and Alain of Lille are the dominant figures in Roth's second period. Guibert, whose treatise Roth does not consider an *ars*, contributes to the conduct book tradition with his stress on the moral credibility of the preacher. In addition, Guibert stresses reason as a tool for expanding the sermon.[35] In contrast, Alain of Lille most values the concordance of authorities for sermon expansion; he has little interest in Scriptural exegesis in sermons. Roth accepts the tradition that Alain's Summa is the first formal art of preaching.[36]

---

[32] Roth, p. 15.

[33] Roth, p. 30.

[34] Roth, pp. 27-29.

[35] Roth, pp. 31-36.

Stage three of the handbook includes the thirteenth-century texts of William of Auvergne and Humbert of Romans. William's De Faciebus is termed the low ebb of handbook theories on facies or similes. William's ars praedicandi is the first text to be actually called by that name and to define the term narrowly; that is, William was the first really to examine the form of the sermon. Part two of this work introduces the important concepts of dilatatio and divisio to handbook writing. In addition, Roth offers a perceptive contrast between the sermon concepts of Alain and William: "Bei Alanus hatten die auctoritates die Funktion, eine Aussage nach allen Seiten hin fest und unumstösslich zu bekräftigen. Guillaume spricht nicht von ihnen, bei ihm ist es die etymologische und syntaktische Struktur der Wörter und Begriffe, die ihm für ihre Wahrheit bürgt."[37] William was less interested in authority and more dependent upon etymology and syntactical analysis for sermon expansion. After William we shall see that the citation of authority never lost its prominent place as an essential technique of sermon making. Nonetheless, William's love for word analysis and simile bore important fruit in later handbooks.

Humbert's treatise has been discussed in detail already. It firmly establishes the conduct book tradition and is the first major ars by a mendicant. Roth argues that Humbert and his new Dominican order bring a radical change to medieval notions of preaching. After 1215 preachers, now mostly mendicants, are outside the jurisdiction of the bishops; and the particular role of preaching in the life of the friar colors preaching theory henceforth. Roth stresses that by the end of the thirteenth century all the parts of the sermon have been established and the main components of medieval preaching theory are known as well. From about 1275 on, the structure of the sermon and the content of the preaching handbook move out of the formative stages. The ars is now subject to refinement and interpretation; the tradition is capable of uninspired repetition or creative reinterpretation.

---

[36] Roth, pp. 42-43.

[37] Roth, p. 54.

The early Scholastics are the first to leave their imprint on the mature ars praedicandi. Psuedo-Bonaventure and Jean of Galles set the groundwork for the learned ars. These textbooks deal with what they regard as a new sermon species, the university thematic sermon. Alain of Lille, of course, spoke of the same sort of sermon; but these writers are the first consciously to regard their sermon style as different from that of the earlier traditions. They set out to develop a distinctive sermon species, and they contrast theirs to previous styles. Roth reasons that the sophistication of the university sermon audience (entirely clerical) naturally made this sermon the most complicated in structure. Consequently, there are many rules and conventions for the university sermon, and the university ars is the most fully developed of the handbooks.[38]

---

[38] Roth, pp. 54-55.

XUM

Pseudo-Bonaventure is the first to discuss the sermon in a part-by-part progression. He divides his treatise into a discussion of parts of the sermon; (division, distinction, and dilation). Jean shares Pseudo-Bonaventure's formal approach to sermon theory and, in Roth's view, establishes the learned handbook as a treatise on the artistic as well as practical aspects of sermon writing.[39]

Roth's fifth handbook period, covering the fourteenth-century Dominican art of preaching is represented by Jacques of Fusignano and Thomas Waleys. Robert of Basevorn should also be included in this period. Roth groups Waleys and Jacques on the basis of their common concern for the preacher's conduct; Robert, too, shows the influence of this tradition.

Jacques's treatise was not available for this study but the work of Thomas Waleys shares an elaborateness with that of Robert which now becomes characteristic of the ars. The treatises are two to three times as long as they were in the twelfth century. They consider dilatatio at length and they expand the number of parts in a sermon to the brink of the ridiculous. These writers, for example, speak of introductions and affirmations of every part of the sermon. The handbook writer now tries to be comprehensive and exhaustive in a Scholastic style. The writers consider all the circumstances of preaching, who may preach, when it is appropriate to preach, and so on. They discuss the causes of preaching (e.g., efficient and final), as well. When they present the parts of the sermon they often also analyze the circumstances and causes of each part. These texts,

---

[39] Roth, pp. 118-122.

XUM

both in their own organization and in the sermon style they present, are elaborate and highly detailed. Treatise and sermon have many separate parts, each containing several subordinate units. Many parts and subordinate units may be employed more than once in a single work. The treatises, like the sermons, are intricate hierarchical structures of ideas. They reflect the analytical habits of the era's sermon writers. But the learnedness of these treatises verges on pedantry; their formal concerns approach the preciosity familiar in much medieval rhetorical practice.

Roth relies on the unedited treatise of Mauritius of Leyden to represent the fifteenth-century reaction against the learned *artes* of the previous century. This period is represented in the present bibliography by Francesc Eiximenis, Martin of Cordova, and Christian Borgsleben. Roth's remarks on Mauritius provide a rich context for understanding the new bent of these treatises. Mauritius, rather than writing a handbook for a fellow university preacher, stressed that the *ars praedicandi* reader was a relatively unlearned, beginning preacher. Further, the *ars* is concerned with preaching to people, not constructing verbal edifices. The sermon is part of a massive educational effort and, according to Roth, Mauritius revives Alain of Lille's preaching definition, "instructio morum et fidei," and takes it literally.[40] Roth attributes this popular turn in preaching theory to the revival of the Augustinian tradition. She cites the important preaching figures of Jean Gerson and Pierre d'Ailly as examples of the new Augustinianism. This shift should be linked also to the new

---

[40] Roth, pp. 120-21.

Church movement of Nominalism. The Nominalists certainly perpetrated an Augustinian revival but their stress on increasing the spiritual responsibilities of the common man, their evangelical mysticism and their reorganization of pastoral priorities argues for a more profound alteration in medieval religious life than Roth's notion of a revival can explain. This era is of crucial importance in the thesis of the present study for it is in the fifteenth century that the practices of the ornate university sermon are transferred to the popular pulpit. The English morality plays must represent both a popular, and a learned, preaching tradition.

The final ars praedicandi period is a peculiarly retrospective one. Roth makes the valuable point that printing becomes an important factor in the intellectual life of the late fifteenth century. The particular influence of the press on the art of preaching is significant for a consideration of the handbook's influence on the morality plays. Roth believes that "Henry of Hesse's" treatise, though placed in the fourteenth century by its editor, Harry Caplan,[41] actually had its real impact on medieval preaching as a fifteenth-century incunabulum.[42] Other treatises of this era are composed in response to or in imitation of earlier handbooks, now printed, especially Augustine's De Doctrina Christiana. (The Augustinian work was printed in 1465 and entitled "Ars Praedicandi Santi Augustini." Roth claims that the work is actually an edition compiled from several texts.)

---

[41] Harry Caplan, "'Henry of Hesse' On the Art of Preaching," PMLA, 48 (1933), 341.

[42] Roth, p. 132.

Pseudo-Aquinas's work is such a handbook. Roth also places the East Anglian Simon Alcok in this category, although the text survives in manuscript, not in printed form. Alcok's treatise is fragmentary; it treats only dilatatio and it bears a striking resemblance to the dilatatio sections of Thomas Waleys's and Robert of Basevorn's works.

Roth's classification makes an important point. The fifteenth-century printed texts do not evidence any change or advance in preaching theory. Instead, they sustain or revive sermon traditions from the early handbook periods. The significant effect of these revivals is that the scholastic preaching ideas are introduced into a milieu which no longer preserves the careful fourteenth-century distinction between sermon styles appropriate to lay and clerical audiences (see Roth's sixth handbook period). The result is that the printed handbooks effectively level any technical distinctions between the two sermon styles. Reading handbooks in a period which has become accustomed to using texts such as Francesc Eiximenis' , the beginning preacher was unlikely to concern himself with the lay-clerical distinctions in handbooks recovered from a previous era. Roth's history of this last period stresses that the medieval preaching handbook tradition is a cumulative one. That is, regardless of whether they were printed or not, the early texts, such as Alain's, Humbert's, and Pseudo-Bonaventure's, are constantly available and regularly studied by medieval preachers and handbook writers. The periodization of the texts themselves is not so important as the characterization of the periods in which they were written. This fairly fine distinction is a necessary one and it should have considerable impact on future ars praedicandi studies. We need to determine, for example, how Alain's Summa was understood in the fourteenth and then in the fifteenth centuries so that we may have a full command of ars praedicandi history and of the way in which a preacher-playwright in fifteenth-century England finally understood the artes in his library.

While Dorothea Roth's historical ordering of the artes praedicandi is of great use, her chronological division is not the only classification applied to the handbooks. The distinction between conduct books and sermon outline books has already been considered. In addition, the texts themselves introduce a contrast between lay and clerical sermon styles. Some scholars have considered dividing the handbooks into popular and clerical sermon manuals. As noted earlier, it is important to this dissertation to establish that in the fifteenth century the ars praedicandi was considered a manual for all sermons and was regarded as especially useful for popular sermons. It is most doubtful that morality playwrights would have used a technique associated with university or clerical preaching in their composition of vernacular dramas.

Roth notes that the university sermon of the fourteenth century confines itself to clerical sermon techniques; then in the fifteenth century a strong popular sermon handbook tradition emerges. Many other scholars, not so attentive to the long history of the ars, have focused on the fourteenth-century Dominican texts and concluded that the ars praedicandi dealt exclusively with sermons for clerics. Charland's argument that the

XUM

handbooks treat the popular sermons only incidentally is an example of a highly respected scholar's claim for clerical dominance of the artes.[43] The fact is that a rigid lay-clerical distinction for sermon technique did not develop until the thirteenth century and once established it was rarely honored. In the early days of the medieval sermon handbook the sole concession made for lay audiences, aside from preaching in the vernacular, was to maintain a greater simplicity of subject matter than was used before assembled clergy. Alain of Lille is so unmindful of lay-clerical distinctions that he supplements his technical discussions with many sample sermons for such assuredly lay groups as soldiers and widowers.[44] William of Auvergne opposed unsuitably sophisticated topics in sermons for the simpler classes of the laity.[45]

Not until Pseudo-Bonaventure do the distinctions between sermons for clergy and laity affect sermon technique rather than sermon matter. But the very title of his text, Ars Concionandi, seems chosen to blur the distinction between clerical and lay preaching.[46] Pseudo-Bonaventure established the internal and external division for medieval sermon theory.

---

[43] Charland, Artes . . ., p.110.

[44] Alain of Lille, cols. 185-86, 194-95.

[45] William of Auvergne, De Faciebus Mundi, ed. A. de Poorter, "Un Manuel de predication médiévale," Revue Neoscholastique de Philosophie, 25 (1923), 198.

[46] The term concionandi is a difficult one to interpret. Alain of Lille expressly declares that praedicandum is not concionandum (col. 112). In this context concionandum seems to mean public oratory as opposed to the specially restricted oratory of the sermon. As a result, it is probably wisest to interpret Pseduo-Bonaventure's use of the term as a reference to preaching in all contexts, both clerical and lay. The treatise confirms this reading.

Internal and external refer to the ways in which the preacher can divide or arrange his analysis of the day's theme. The division processes in sermon making roughly correspond to the presentation of an outline of the sermon's form and content. Pseudo-Bonaventure reserves internal division for clerical audiences. These devices might include philosophical distinctions implied by words in the theme, or multiple causal analyses and analyses stemming from the precise meaning of the text. External division, good for popular preaching, moves away from the meaning of the theme. Rather than developing the sermon through intensive analysis, the preacher uses the ideas or only the terms of the theme as cues to introduce exempla or to develop moral and doctrinal points having only tangential relationships to the theme itself. A theme mentioning adultery might prompt a preacher using external division to take up chastity and devote much of his sermon to a discussion of all seven virtues. More literal examples of external division would permit the preacher to discuss faith and hope as divisions of a text which uses the term "charity." Clearly, the external division had moral and spiritual instruction as its end while internal division additionally stressed scholarship and formal aesthetic balance.

The distinction between internal and external division is discussed at length by Étienne Gilson in an article which was very important to early twentieth-century *ars praedicandi* scholarship. In this work Gilson relies on the *Ars Concionandi* to evaluate and contrast the techniques of the sermon in thirteenth-century Pseudo-Bonaventure to that of Michel Menot, a fifteenth-century preacher. Gilson regrets the decay (as he sees it) of sermon form in Menot's work. But he also observes, after presenting the Pseudo-Bonaventuran internal-external division, that this writer himself does not rigidly observe the conventions of internal and external sermon division. Indeed, the two styles of division were never meant to be interpreted as a rigid separation of technique.[47]

Nonetheless, by the fourteenth century the distinctions have hardened and Robert of Basevorn, who is really the first handbook writer to command a full historical overview of preaching theory, offers a whole set of rules for lay preaching. The preacher should not be pedantic nor attempt to awe his audience with an excessive use of Latin. Only in popular sermons should one resort to simply piling up (and not dividing or analyzing) authorities. Some types of amplification are too rich for the laity. Robert, ever the formalist, offers a general outline of a lay sermon:

> [Preachers should] choose three materials which they consider very useful and fitting for their listeners. They divide the theme into these three and prove (1) the first by something evident in nature or art or in both, adducing for their proposition an authority of the Bible which contains an example, actually and verbally a statement from which the first material was chosen. (2) They demonstrate this same thing by some figure of the Old Testament, or at least the Bible. (3) They demonstrate the same by some authentic narrative. This they do with the second material and afterwards with the third so that the whole form of the sermon will consist of three beautiful examples, three figures and three narratives.[48]

---

[47] Étienne Gilson, "Michel Menot et la technique du sermon médiéval," *Les Idees et les Lettres* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1932), reprinted from *Revue d'Histoire Franciscaine,* 2 (1925), p. 114.

[48] Robert of Basevorn, *The Form of Preaching,* trans. Leopold Krul in *Three Medieval Rhetorical Arts,* ed. James J. Murphy (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1971), p. 205.

XUM

Robert's contemporary, Thomas Waleys, stresses that erudition is the primary difference between lay and clerical sermons; but later in his treatise he abandons a distinction related largely to sermon matter and makes formal distinctions. Rather than taking a single, fairly short Scriptural passage for a theme the lay sermon can very profitably take the day's entire lection as its theme. Such practice produced a less complex, more practical, lay sermon. It also produced a sermon fundamentally different in form from the thematic sermon of earlier periods.

As Roth indicates, the *artes praedicandi* of the fifteenth century are distinguished by their application of university sermon theory of the previous three centuries. Mauritius of Leyden's treatise, according to Roth, presents a sermon scheme which is a clear preservation of the Scholastic *ars praedicandi*. Yet Mauritius explicitly directs his handbook to lay sermon preachers.[49] Francesc Eiximenis entitles his text *Ars Praedicandi Populo* and seriously deals with the needs of a lay sermon audience. Martin of Cordova's treatise also deals practically with lay sermon technique. He recommends introducing the theme of a popular sermon with narratives or histories. He continues throughout his *ars* to adapt clerical sermon practices to a lay congregation. In the following passage he stresses the value of the narrative for lay sermons:

> . . . si accipis thema ex Ewangelio, potes introducere recitando totam ystoriam Ewangelii, et iste est bonus pro rusticis qui delectantur in istis narrationibus. Ego ipse quando contigit me transire per eos et

---

[49] Roth, p. 127.

XUM

> predicare, non teneo alium modum nisi accipio verbum de Ewangelio, et sine alia subtilitate recito ystoriam, interponendo aliquas moralitates, et sic concludo thema.[50]

Christian Borgsleben, the latest of the handbook writers considered in this study, achieves an even greater leveling of lay and clerical sermon differences. Very much in the vein of the earlier university artes, Borgsleben offers the following popular sermon format:

> . . . promisi me velle dare modum faciendi introducciones ad populum vulgares, quibus mediantibus mens ingeniosa facile potest pervenire ad maiorem noticiam. Ubi est sciendum, quod volens facere unum praeambulum pro thematis illacione debet considerare tria in themate: principaliter videlicet sensum oppositum thematis, 2° virtutem verborum thematis in se, 3° unam divisionem vel distinccionem vel unum notabile, in quo tangatur materia thematis, et sic introduccio potest fieri per tria: primo per materiam oppositam verborum thematis, 2° per materiam directe tangentem thema in sua virtualitate bona vel mala, 3° per divisionem vel notabile vel distinccionem.[51]

Borgsleben is recommending a few of the most popular and effective of the university sermon devices for lay sermons. He writes very late in the medieval handbook tradition and he is aware of the conventional distinction between the two classes of medieval audience. It is noteworthy that Borgsleben acknowledges and then contravenes the division between popular and clerical preaching.

---

[50] Martin of Cordova, p. 335.

[51] Christian Borgsleben, Ars Praedicandi, ed. Georg Buchwald, "Die Ars Praedicandi des Erfurter Franziskaners Christian Borgsleben," Franziskanische Studien, I (1921), 71-72.

As has been suggested already, the conscious division between the two sermon types breaks down with the accelerated backwash of earlier preaching theory through printing.[52] When Augustine's, William of Auvergne's, and Henry of Hesse's treatises are printed and recirculated the result is a new treatise like that of Pseudo-Aquinas. The author recognizes a lay-clerical preaching distinction but fails to understand the difference as conceived in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Instead, Pseudo-Aquinas focuses on the popular sermon and speaks of it as the university sermon was customarily presented. For example, while discussing the parts of the lay sermon, which include subdivisions, Pseudo-Aquinas explains, "To [subdivisions] two principles apply: the deduction of those parts preached--through proofs and exhortations on the virtues--and the avoidance of faults."[53] In an earlier handbook era the "deduction" of parts or arguments and "proofs" of the virtues for a popular audience would not have been tolerated.

One further aspect of _ars praedicandi_ classification remains to be considered. In the fourteenth century the handbooks themselves attempted historical overviews of preaching theory. Their motive was partly to articulate forcefully the appropriate occasions for a variety of sermon techniques. It was also partly to distinguish their preferred preaching styles from those of dissenting contemporaries. The fourteenth-century handbooks first take up the remarks of Alain and Humbert on the relation between medieval and Patristic preaching styles. This topos justifies the differences between Christ's and the Evangelists' preaching and handbook-style preaching. The first preachers and the Fathers were divinely inspired; medieval preachers not so graced must resort to technical aids such as handbooks and florilegia. Robert of Basevorn is the first to present this distinction between ancient and modern sermon theory; he combines it with his own perception of modern sermon theory. Robert outlines six major classes of preaching. First is Christ's method, which relies largely on promises and the person of Christ himself. This method is perfect and contains all subsequent methods. Paul represents the second sermon tradition. He preached by reason and authority; Robert recommends Paul's sermons as theme sources. Augustine followed Paul closely, but used whole gospels for his themes instead of brief passages. His homiletic technique rests primarily on reason. Gregory, the fourth preaching example, relies on figures from the Old Testament, tangible examples, and entreaty. He focuses on moral issues in his sermons and likes to pile on authorities; for the laity he relies on exemplum and anecdote. Bernard uses much rhetorical coloring, stresses Scripture, and uses much authority for confirmation. The final sermon style is the modern, which Robert subdivided into the Paris and Oxford methods. Robert is critical of both insomuch as they are inferior to the first five methods. They are eclectic styles which pick and choose among the earlier practices for their methods.[54] Robert, who hardly advocated a simple sermon style in his handbook, nevertheless criticizes the Oxford method for its preciosity. A comparison of Robert's descriptions of the protheme in each style demonstrates his view.

---

[52] The _ars praedicandi_ seems to have enjoyed great popularity in the fifteenth century. Caplan cites as evidence the library catalogue of the Benedictine abbey of Teugernsee which in 1500 had twelve _artes_ in a 1500-2000 manuscript collection ("Classical Rhetoric," p. 79).

[53] Pseudo-Aquinas, _A Brief Religious Tract on the Art and True Method of Preaching_, trans. Harry Caplan, "A Late Medieval Tractate on Preaching," in _Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of J. A. Winans_ (New York: Century Co., 1925), p. 74.

> Paris method:
> . . . there is a short introduction with an example for the sense; how that example is verified by Scripture; how both the example and the verification are concluded by one authority which agrees with both; how every theme agrees with the three aforementioned things; how the theme is easily and, for those understanding, intelligently divided; how all parts are stated with sensible examples and verified with agreeing authorities; how the last authority agrees with the first, that is the authority of the introduction; how one proceeds from this authority to the prayer [typify this style].
>
> English (Oxford) method:
> [these preachers] multiply the statement in such a way that they add to the division of the theme a double statement of the parts without authorities, and afterwards a third statement of the parts and an expression of the words of the theme, and then immediately add to this third statement of parts a brief verification of the parts . . . . Some add to this mode, after a verification by Biblical authority, verification by an original authority, and this is elegant if it agrees with and explains the authority to which it is added . . . . In this ornament one must be aware that there be no division between at least one statement and its verification, i.e., one must make sure that the authority of the verification should never be added unless another statement immediately precedes.[55]

---

[54] Robert of Basevorn, pp. 127-30.

[55] Robert of Basevorn, pp. 172, 178-80.

Robert's sermon classifications are noteworthy for their historical perspective and for their recognition of a specific English preaching method.

Thomas Waleys acknowledges Robert's scheme and he contrasts Oxford and Paris preaching styles. However, he adds his own classification of sermon styles. Waleys's divisions are less historical and more analytical; sermons fall into narrative, deductive, and argumentative modes.[56] Subsequent handbooks all survey sermon history and types, using the schemes of Robert and Thomas. The overviews become as much a part of the ars praedicandi tradition as the discussion of the preacher's conduct.

The classification of sermon styles is of particular interest to this study because Robert gives the first indication of a peculiarly English preaching tradition. In the era of handbooks prior to Robert the preaching theorists formed a learned and sophisticated group centered at the University of Paris. Scholars, handbook writers, and many preachers moved in and out of Paris developing and disseminating ideas about preaching in a manner which made the notion of a nationally distinguishable preaching theory or tradition unlikely. With the fourteenth century and the Hundred Years' War this situation changed. When Edward III called home the English scholars he effectively shut down the English nation at the University of Paris. The result was a new lustre for Oxford scholarship. Robert of Basevorn and Thomas Waleys are products of this royal chauvinism and their perception of difference between English and French

---

[56] Thomas Waleys, De Modo Componendi Sermones, ed. Thomas-Marie Charland in Artes Praedicandi, pp. 358-61.

XUM

sermon theory is inevitable, whether or not the difference was actual. From the fourteenth century on it is legitimate to speak of an English ars praedicandi tradition. However, the divorce of English and continental scholarship was by no means complete and the English scholars who were repatriated brought all of the sermon theory popular at Paris back to the flourishing Oxford preaching activity. Nonetheless, university learning loses its homogeneity at this time, at least with respect to preaching.

The investigation of an English theory of preaching returns us to the controversy between Murphy and Shoeck discussed earlier. Regardless of the origins or the exact moment at which rhetoric became a part of the Oxford curriculum, it is indisputable that by the fifteenth century the ars praedicandi was an established rhetorical manual in England. In Three Medieval Rhetorical Arts Murphy lists the preaching handbooks attributed to Englishmen. The bibliography is impressive:

> Thirteenth century: Alexander Ashby, Richard of Thetford--"one of the most influential in Europe" [see Pseudo-Bonaventure], Hugh Sneyth, and Jean of Galles.
>
> Fourteenth century: Robert of Basevorn, Thomas Waleys, Robert Holcott, and Ranulph Higden.
>
> Fifteenth Century: Geoffrey Schale, Simon Alcok, Thomas Penketh, and Thomas of Salisbury.[57]

Only five of these texts were available to the present study; only Alcok's was available among the important fifteenth-century studies.

There is another avenue of inquiry besides the scant information available on sermon manuals which offers some ideas on the nature of preaching theory in late medieval England. It is likely that the preaching manuals popular in the fifteenth century reflect practices in the pulpits of a slightly earlier era. Sermon style, in turn, would reflect the general cultural trends of an area and period. That is, by examining the interests and taste of middle and late fourteenth-century Englishmen, an historian may find insight into English sermon theory of the fifteenth century. This avenue, while not well explored, is clearly of interest to Beryl Smalley and Dorothea Roth. Smalley's observation that the fourteenth century was a period of considerable "humanistic" activity in England suggests some conclusions on the nature of the sermon theory current in the era of the morality plays. This is a complex inquiry and only a few points can be proposed at this time.

---

[57] Murphy, Three Medieval Rhetorical Arts, p. xx.

Smalley first observes a ravenous appetite for sermons in the fourteenth-century English laity. Evidence of this interest is the effort to expand existing churches, presumably to accomodate larger congregations.[58] The audiences of this period apparently preferred sermons which dealt with classical culture. Careful to avoid any claims of an English fourteenth-century renaissance, Smalley belittles the calibre of this classicism:

> This survey has sketched in the lay background to the development of scholarship in medieval England. The cult of story-telling was recognised and the stories included antiquity. The public was not passive but active. It had the clamorous greed of children. Indeed, from the point of view of imbibing classical culture, it was at the level of Tanglewood Tales . . . . The lay attitude mattered to scholarship. Intellectually, clerk and layman belonged to distinct but interacting worlds, the scholars forming an elite within the clergy. Our scholars [at Oxford] are all friars, whose job is teaching and preaching.

---

[58] Beryl Smalley, English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1960), pp. 26-27.

> On the one hand, the growth of an educated laity stimulated them. It was bound to do so, given the pupil teacher relationship between priest and layman. On the other hand, it set a ceiling to their achievements. It would have been difficult to cultivate Petrarchan sensibility among these legend-hungry louts, as they would have seemed to Petrarch. A small group of patrons capable of appreciating scholarship, and a public wholly given over to sport and the "cupful ale", might have provided a more propitious milieu for a classical revival than this half-and-half affair. But then early fourteenth-century scholarship would have lacked its distinctive characteristics. There would have been no Robert Holcot and later on no Chaucer.[59]

The effect of such popular demand for classical lore was a distinctive coterie of preaching classicists at fourteenth-century Oxford. One of the key figures in the group was Thomas Waleys, clearly a favorite figure for Miss Smalley. Despite the elaborate nature of Waley's ars, Smalley believes that he opposes the formalism of the learned fourteenth-century sermon manuals; in addition, she notes considerable classicism in the text's sample sermons.[60] Elsewhere Smalley uses her reading of this treatise as evidence to indicate that Thomas was an early humanist.[61] Roth cites Smalley's studies of Thomas and speaks of his Aristotelian studies: " . . . er ist der typische Vertreter einer Gruppe von Gelehrten, die versuchten, das durch die Bücher des Aristoteles erweiterte Weltbild in die Schrifterklärung einzubeziehen."[62] According to Smalley, these activities place Thomas in the midst of a fourteenth-century Oxford humanist movement to "natural" learning. This group developed a fascination with natural science and designs and the interest penetrates the substance and imagery of their preaching techniques and sermons.[63] The stature accorded to Thomas by both Roth and Smalley suggests that this handbook writer may have had an impact on fifteenth-century sermon theory beyond that evidenced by Simon Alcok's treatise. Certainly major influence should not be claimed for Thomas on scant evidence. Nonetheless Smalley and Roth represent this writer as the center of an influential Oxford coterie; and Smalley stresses that the writing and lecturing of this group was intended to supply sermon material and ideas for fellow preachers and students.[64]

---

[59] Smalley, p. 28.

[60] Smalley, p. 101.

[61] Beryl Smalley, "Thomas Waleys, O.P.," Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 24 (1954), 98.

[62] Roth, pp. 104-06.

There was a second element in fourteenth-century English culture which also probably had impact on sermon traditions of the fifteenth century; but it does not focus at Oxford. Instead, G. R. Owst sees a sudden fifteenth-century popularity of devotional and sermon materials.[65] These texts included continental sermons or devotional treatises like those of the mystic and Nominalist Meister Eckhardt or Heinrich Suso; and they were translated into English in great quantity by the masters of English devotional prose like Richard Rolle and Walter Hylton. These Yorkshire writers, who spanned the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, constituted a distinctive school of religious writers whose interests centered on the Passion and whose point of view expressed a fascination with natural functions and design reminiscent of the Oxford humanists.[66] Their works and translations were widely copied and circulated throughout the fifteenth century. In the literary vocabulary of Erich Auerbach and Charles Muscatine this interest is called pathetic or creaturly naturalism. The term in part refers to the compulsive fascination with graphically depicted anguish, physical and spiritual, which gripped the artistic imagination of the bourgeois classes in northern Europe in the late middle ages. The original writings and translations of the Yorkshire prose writers were tremendously popular with the fifteenth-century English laity; and preachers drew upon these writers for sermon materials and ideas.

---

[63] Smalley, English Friars, p. 82.

[64] Smalley, English Friars, pp. 28-34, 79-84.

[65] Owst, p. 286.

The traditional sermon matter, but evidently not the form, was revised and reinterpreted to satisfy new popular interests and new pastoral objectives. If the evidence of the Oxford humanists, the English devotional prose tradition, and few fifteenth-century English sermon handbooks is reliable, it is apparent that late medieval English preaching adapted a venerable sermon frame to new material and different, more emotional ends. This development has great importance for the late Middle English drama.

---

[66] Pathetic naturalism and a fascination with the Passion are most often associated with the religious movements of the Low Countries in the fifteenth century. The best known of these groups is the Brethern of the Common Life. Johan Huizinga discusses this phenomenon in "Religious Sensibility and Religious Imagination" in the Waning of the Middle Ages, (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1949, rpt. 1954), pp. 190-99. Erich Auerbach discusses the impact of these movements on medieval literature in Mimesis, tr. Willard R. Trask (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1953), p. 170. Despite the frequent association of pathetic naturalism with the fifteenth century and the Low Countries, many of its aspects appear in the English devotional

While a tenuous poise among the continued influences of old artes praedicandi, current preaching theories, and current sermon practice is the object of every historical study of medieval preaching theory, those elements seem unusually difficult to balance for fifteenth-century England. Preachers in this period are striving to meet the spiritual needs and worldly interests of a semi-educated, often bourgeois audience. They are using traditional sermon forms and tools taken from handbooks mostly written in a Scholastic era. But the preachers are becoming involved in new, anti-scholastic trends in pastoral theology. The result is the reshaping of an established preaching tradition in part through careful rethinking, in part through basic misunderstanding. It is in the midst of this greater than usual instability that one must search for a characterization of the ars praedicandi as understood by a morality playwright. It is certain that some sermon theory elements remain unchanged from their first mention in Alain of Lille and his colleagues. Every handbook first views preaching as a useful medium designed to save men's souls through instruction in faith and morals. The preacher's worthy bearing and conduct remain important and Scripture is always regarded as the

---

prose writers (often called mystics) of the fourteenth century. The contemplation of the sufferings of Christ and the discussion of "bodily seeing" or feeling are noted in several of these writers by David Knowles [The English Mystics (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, Ltd., 1927), pp. 88, 124, 134; and The English Mystical Tradition (N.Y.: Harper & Bros., 1961), p. 124]. In fact, Knowles discusses, and then suspends judgment on, the possibility that the Christo-centric aspects of part two of Hilton's Scale of Perfection are the emendations of fifteenth-century Carthusians (. . . Mystical Tradition, p. 103).

first and essential authority for his teaching. But it has been determined that the fifteenth-century ars praedicandi writer is becoming conciously interested in popular preaching and is leveling the distinctions between lay and clerical sermon technique and content. In addition, new naturalistic interests in English writing are forging a distinctive fifteenth-century sermon tradition. Let us now consider the sermon form itself as it has relevance to the English morality plays.

XUM

CHAPTER II: Three Principles of Sermon Theory

It is not feasible for the present writer to undertake a thorough presentation of the ars praedicandi tradition. Unfortunately, there is no comprehensive study of sermon form as presented by the sermon handbook writers. I am eager to help to fill this lacuna; but the present study must look toward the English morality plays. As a result, the survey of preaching theory offered in the following pages focuses only on aspects of sermon theory which are relevant to the morality plays.

In my reading of the extant, edited artes praedicandi I have found four principles which recur in medieval discussions of sermon making. Three of these are also of great importance in the design of the fifteenth-century English morality plays. I call them authority, contraries, and sermonic voice. The fourth principle, thematic structure, has no analogue in the plays and, despite its importance in sermon design, it will not be discussed in detail in the present essay. Instead, this consideration of the artes praedicandi will give special attention to the three principles which are shared by the sermons and plays.

The special dramatic interests of the study have naturally imperiled the objectivity of my consideration of sermon theory. This problem is exaggerated because the ars praedicandi uses the thematic structure as the outline of its presentation. The preaching theorists deal with authority, contraries, and sermonic voice, but their treatments are always within a part-by-part progression through the thematic sermon. That is, I have analyzed the medieval theorists' presentation of sermon theory and determined that there are some basic assumptions in their thinking which are not overtly expressed in the handbooks. I have grouped many of these assumptions under the headings sermonic voice and contraries. The terms are not used in the handbooks. But a study of recurrent topics in sample sermon outlines or of patterns of handbook organization reveals common ideas on the art of preaching which are not overtly discussed in the handbooks. The conventional format for medieval rhetorical manuals may have precluded consideration of these two principles. The manual's part-by-part analysis made certain generalizations about sermon writing difficult. Such considerations would have disrupted the practical advice the handbook was designed to give.

Thematic Structure

The handbooks describe a thematic sermon consisting of a theme or Scriptural quotation followed by a protheme which afforded the preacher a graceful opening and an opportunity to capture the interest of his hearers. The preacher then prayed and next introduced his theme; then he divided it. Each division required confirmation and dilation or filling out. Divisions were sometimes subdivided and these smaller divisions were confirmed or filled out, as well.

The history of the preaching handbook shows the swift development of an elaborate sermon form. The thirteenth-and fourteenth-century handbooks proliferate subdivisions, introductions, and confirmations of parts in the sermons. Theorists of this period took a simple form and embellished it to a point near confusion. Later handbooks show little of the copiousness of parts or the inventiveness of the scholastic manuals; and fifteenth-century sermon theory blurs or disregards many of the niceties of earlier sermon form. The later books retain only the theme, protheme, prayer, introduction, division, confirmation, and dilation. Because thematic sermon design, as developed in the handbooks of Thomas Waleys and Robert of Basevorn, was less carefully practised in the fifteenth century, the absence of a correlative design in the English morality plays is not surprising. Nor should this fact threaten the validity of arguments that medieval sermon theory influenced morality play dramaturgy.

Authority

Authority is the simplest of the three devices shared by sermon and drama. It is easy to recognize a playwright or preacher quoting authority and both do it frequently. The citation of authority is a fundamental principle of learned medieval expression. In a later chapter, I will attempt to demonstrate that, while dramatic and preaching traditions partake of this general medieval habit, there is also a particular resemblance between sermonic and dramatic citation of authority.

The sermon theorists regarded authority as the preacher's primary resource. The many surviving _florilegia_ evidence the value medieval writers placed on having a handy and accessible store of scriptural, patristic, and popular quotations with which to enrich their works. The thematic structure of the sermon also fostered the preeminence of authority as a sermon resource. The theme, sometimes called the seed or kernel of a sermon's design, is a carefully selected Scriptural quotation. It is the supreme authority, the single most important statement, in the thematic sermon. The handbook discussions of theme portray the selection and arrangement of authority as the essence of sermon invention and disposition. The handbook writers stress that the theme contains the whole of the sermon in minature. So Jean of Galles tells the preacher, "thema proponere in quo omnia dicenda virtualiter sunt contenta."[1] This view is expressed with special frequency in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century manuals. Francesc Eiximenis argues that the whole sermon is ordered as a contemplation of some "materia" presented in the theme.[2] He defines theme, "thema vel illam materiam de que vis praedicare."[3] A contemporary of Francesc's, Martin of Cordova, defines theme as a brief and authentic authority "superquam fundatur propositum et ex qua processus sermonis trahit originem . . . . Unde sic se habet thema ad sermonem sicut vas ad edificium, sicut radix ad arborem . . . sicut caput ad membra."[4] It is widely accepted that the theme holds, at least latently, all the parts and the essence of the sermon. Elsewhere we shall see that the proper selection and division of a theme constitute the most important choices in sermon writing.

---

[1] Jean of Galles, Forma Praedicandi, ed. Woodburn O. Ross, "A Brief Forma Praedicandi," Modern Philology, 34 (1937), 341.

[2] Francesc Eiximenis, Ars Praedicandi, ed. Martí de Barcelona, "L'Ars Praedicandi de Francesc Eiximenis, "Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia, 12 (1936), 331.

[3] Francesc Eiximenis, p. 323.

[4] Martin of Cordova, Ars Praedicandi, ed. Fernando Rubio, "Ars Praedicandi," La Cuidad de Dios, 172 (1959), 332.

XUM

The protheme, also called the prelocution, the antetheme, the exordium, and the captatio benevolentiae, immediately follows the statement of the theme. It consists of a second authority, which is not necessarily a Scriptural quotation, and a discussion or digression. The artes praedicandi unanimously insist on the inclusion of a protheme in the sermon; but there is considerable difference of opinion on the actual purpose of the quotation.[5] The list of its alternate medieval names gives some evidence of the different conceptions of the protheme's purpose. They range from an authority intended to amplify the meaning of the theme to a brief digression intended to seize the attention and good will of the congregation. Martin of Cordova's fifteenth-century treatise attempts to include most of these functions in its description of the protheme: ". . . debebat concordare cum themate vel dictione populi et dirigi ad Beatam Virginem . . . [this last is a reference to the conventional inclusion of the Ave Maria in the prayer of the sermon]." Martin continues, ". . . mihi tamen videtur quod prothema est quoddam exordium, quod debet tria continere per que auditores redantur attenti, dociles et beniuoli . . . . vel, loco thematis, potest adducere alique que faciunt homines attenti ad audiendum verbum Dei; vel potest exordiri comparando sermonem refectionem corporis, que, si debite debeat sumi, premitti debet oratio, sic in sermone vel scientia, sic dicendo quod sicut semen non germinat sine pluuia, sic nunc sermo sine oratione . . . ."[6] The protheme represents a formalized use of authority in the sermon. It does not advance the preacher's argument in any way.

---

[5] Étienne Gilson is similarly troubled by the function of the protheme in the medieval sermon. He observes that the theme is followed by the protheme "dont le rapport au premier n'est pas toujours évident." At best, Gilson regards the protheme as a transitional element. It moves the preacher from the theme to the prayer. ("Michel Menot et la technique du sermon médiévale," Les Idees et les Lettres [Paris: J. Vrin, 1932], p. 102.)

The theme and protheme constitute but a fraction of the typical medieval sermon, however. The bulk of the later medieval sermon consisted of the division and dilation of the theme.[7] In discussing these sermon parts the artes praedicandi fully reveal the pervasive role of authority in sermon design. Division consists either of breaking up the actual words of the theme into three or more discrete ideas for discussion or of taking three ideas for discussion from the full text of the theme. That is, the very words and phrases of the theme frequently served to outline the sermon itself. These divisions were often "confirmed" by more authorities.

After the preacher divided his theme he expanded or discussed each of his divisions. The manuals call this expansion dilatatio and it is generally the final topic in the treatises. Dilation occurred in two places in the thematic sermon. The introduction of the theme followed the prayer and enabled the preacher to justify his choice of theme and to outline the arguments and divisions to be used in the remainder of the sermon. The ensuing realization of the ideas presented in the introduction is called the prosecutio of the theme. It should be regarded as the most important dilation in the sermon. Dilatatio also occurred in the later parts of the sermon; there it was a lesser expansion such as the filling out of a sub-division or the use of devices to realize the plan of the prosecutio.

---

[6] Martin Cordova, pp. 332-333.

[7] The Pseudo-Bonaventuran treatise, Ars Concionandi, offers good evidence for the preoccupation of handbook writers with division and dilation. This treatise is thirteen pages long in the Quaracchi Brothers' edition. It is divided into three parts; the last two, on division and dilation techniques alone, occupy five pages.

Dilatatio, in a sense, is not actually a sermon part but a method for composing sermons. The dilatatio sections in the manuals always recommend the citation of authority as a useful and effective way to develop the sermon's theme and its divisions. Some manuals, like the "Tractatus . . . de Modo Componendi Sermones" of Simon Alcok, simply list effective ways (with examples) of expanding Scriptural authorities or themes. More elaborate handbooks consider the function of dilatatio as well as the techniques. Thomas Waleys gives a vigorous argument for the importance of dilatatio:

> Postquam praedicator thema suum divisit et modum procedendi sibi statuit alterutrum trium modorum praedictorum, restat ut jam in principali sermonis procedatur. Introductio enim thematis et ejus divisio et praefixio modi procedendi videntur quaedam preambula et accessoria, respectu eorum quae sequentur. Et ideo debet principaliter praedicator laborare ut ea quae sequentur sint bona et aedificatoria. Ne tamen sint impertinentia ad praecedentia, vel ne desit connexio debita inter ea quae dicentur, et sic totus processus principalis sit quasi quaedam congeries lapidum qui sibi invicem non aptantur, similiter ne praedicatori desit praedicandi materia, oportet quod sciat quomodo, absque omni impertinentia et cum connexione debita, se possit dilatare. Et istud est necessarium tam in introductione thematis, si praedicator se vult ibi dilatare, quam etiam in prosecutione principali ipsius sermonis.[8]

---

[8] Thomas Waleys, De Modo Componendi Sermones, ed. Thomas-Marie Charland in Artes Praedicandi: Contribution à l'Histoire de la Rhétorique au Moyen Âge, Publications de l'Institut d'Études Médiévales d'Ottawa, 7 (Paris: J. Vrin, 1936), p. 386.

Waleys concludes these opening remarks on dilatatio by stressing the multiplicity of ways to expand a sermon, "Si autem aliter fiet, hoc erit propter auctoritatum penuriam; quam non patietur praedicator, si thema bene acceperit, prudenter diviserit, et alia servaverit quae superius docui."[9]

Waley's remarks are all the more relevant because he practically equates dilation and the citation of authority. A few lines after the first passage cited above Waleys declares, "Quantum ad modum dilatandi, est ista diversitas, nam quidam in dilatando se utuntur solum auctoritatibus vel Sacrae Scripturae, vel aliorum doctorum catholicorum, et quandoque philosophorum gentilium, praecipue qui de morali scientia scripserunt, sicut Tullii, seu Senecae, vel aliorum qui aliqua verba moralia suis operibus miscuerunt; ita quod isti procedunt de auctoritate ad auctoritatem quasi continue usque ad finem prosecutionis illius membri divisionis vel distinctionis seu pluralitatis acceptionis cui immorantur . . . ."[10] Throughout his treatise Waleys stresses the great supply of authorities for sermon dilation. He scorns the preacher who cannot find enough material for his sermon.

A similar radical dependence on authority in sermon making is found in Alain of Lille's treatise, though the Summa predates the use of the term dilatatio in sermon theory. For Alain, Scripture is the most important source of sermon material; but Patristic authority, or even secular authority, can be used in less prominent or weighty parts of the sermon.

---

[9] Thomas Waleys, p. 387.

[10] Thomas Waleys, p. 386.

What is striking about the Summa de Arte Praedicatoria is that it makes so few suggestions for sermon material other than authority. Early in his treatise Alain declares, "Haec autem debet esse forma praedicationis, ut initium sumatur ab auctoritate theologica, tanquam a suo proprio fundamento: maxime ab Evangeliis [etc.]. Quia in his specialiter resultat moralis instructio . . . ."[11] Alain later argues that care should be taken in the selection of authorities. They should suit the needs and abilities of the congregation: "Consequenter debet accedere ad auctoritatis propositae expositionem, et totam inflectere ad auditorum instructionem; nec auctoritatem nimis obscuram vel difficilem proponat, ne auditores eam fastidiant, et ita minus attente audiant. Nec in auctoritatis expositione, debet nimis cito a proposito recedere, ne primum medio, medium ne discrepet imo. Debet etiam alias auctoritates inducere ad id asserendum, maxime, quae pertinent ad propositum."[12] Then, after presenting a sample theme and division, Alain strongly urges the preacher to adduce confirming authorities: "Sic praedicator omnem divisionem quam proponit auctoritatibus debet roborare, aliter tota divisio nutans est et lubrica."[13] And, after an exhortation which interprets and applies the teaching of the sample theme, Alain advises his reader, "Post haec, praedicator concludat admonitionem suam in exemplari doctrina, ostendens quomodo antiqui Patres contempserint mundum . . . ."[14] That is, even the examples in the sermon are to be quoted authorities.

---

[11] Alain of Lille, col. 113.

[12] Alain of Lille, col. 114.

[13] Alain of Lille, col. 115.

Alain's treatise is one of the most influential in the later Middle Ages. While he surely took his reliance on authority from the long tradition of Christian oratory which preceded him, his handbook fixes that focus on authority in the sermon manual tradition. For example, three hundred years after his time, Alain's influence shows clearly in a remark in the popular Pseudo-Aquinas tract: "As the theme, prelocution, division, and subdivision of the theme now stand, the sermon is not yet complete unless some principal part is amplified through other materials, to wit, through adduced authorities. Otherwise the sermon becomes too short and simple."[15] The remark is a startlingly close parallel to Alain's urging that the preacher support his arguments with authority lest they seem "nutans . . . et lubrica."[16]

Authority is an especially crucial sermon device throughout the thirteenth century. The university handbook writers begin to classify and refine types of authority, their proper occasion, and the procedures involved in using authority. M.-M. Davy concludes that the thirteenth-century university sermon was composed mostly of authorities taken from Scripture, the Fathers, Biblical glosses, or the Ancients.[17] Authority was

---

[14] Alain of Lille, col. 116.

[15] Pseudo-Aquinas, p. 76.

[16] Alain of Lille, col. 115.

[17] Marie Magdelaine Davy, Les Sermons universitaires Parisiens 1230-1231, Études Philosophie Médiévale, vol. 15 (Paris: J. Vrin, 1931), p. 315.

XUM

divided into doctrinal references and decorative quotations; it functioned as proof of an argument or as a means of lending weight and grace to the preacher's own arguments.[18] The proper concordance of authority and the classification of types of concordances preoccupied the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century treatise writers.

Pseudo-Bonaventure calls the citation of authority a kind of *dilatatio* and introduces the formal discussion of concordance to the handbook tradition:

> Quartus modus dilatandi est per *auctoritates concordantes*. Variatur autem iste modus tripliciter; *unus* modus est, quando auctoritates varias sententias habentes in aliquo termino conveniunt, per quem omnino definitae non sunt; unde Psalmus: *Beatus vir, qui non abiit in consilio impiorum* etc. De hoc viro habetur in Iob: *Accinge sicut vir lumbos tuos*; et alibi: *Beatus vir, qui timet Dominum*.
>
> *Alius* modus est, quando auctoritates concordant in sententia quamvis non conveniant in aliquo termino; verbi gratia: *Fides sine operibus mortua est*, et in Genesi: *Dixit Rachel ad Iacob: Da mihi liberos; alioquin moriar*. Per *Rachel*, quae interpretatur *videns principium*, significatur fides, qua videmus Deum; per *liberos* intelligimus bona opera in caritate facta . . . . *Tertius* modus est, quando una auctoritas dicit minus plene, alia dicit magis perfecte; verbi gratia: *Sic currite, ut comprehendatis*; quomodo autem sit currendum, determinatur In Psalmo, cum dicitur: *Cucurri in siti*; et alibi: *Sine iniquitate cucurri et direxi*; et alibi: *Viam mandatorum tuorum cucurri*.[19]

---

[18] Davy, p. 345.

[19] Pseudo-Bonaventure, *Ars Concionandi* in *S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia*, 9 (Rome: Quaracchi Brothers, 1882-1902), p. 18.

There are three ways, for Pseudo-Bonaventure, to "concord" authority. The first will eventually be called vocaliter or verbal concordance in the handbook terminology; the second will be called realiter, i.e., actual or sense ("sententia") concordance. The third, which never really becomes a popular category in the handbook classifications, is called augmenting concordance. It is a concordance which has a "realiter" relationship to the authority it elaborates; but it does not fully illustrate or apply to the topic authority.

The relative merits and usefulness of real and verbal concordances of authority preoccupy most later artes praedicandi. The varying opinions are of little interest to the present study. But the dispute over whether a preacher should strive for the more aesthetically satisfying concordance which agrees aurally with the sermon's theme or should seek to enlighten his congregation with concordances focusing on the sense of the theme has important ramifications for a study of the use of authority in the morality plays. Most sermon theorists conclude that the best concordance is both verbal and real; but they continue the controversy. The liveliness of the debate probably reflects the scarcity of concordances on popular sermon themes which could achieve both verbal and real agreement. We shall see that the plays strive for the combined verbal and real concordance in their use of authority.

It is evident that the citation of authority is a fundamental practice in medieval preaching. The selection and division of a suitable Scriptural authority constituted the main labor of sermon invention and disposition. The effective and artful marshalling of confirming and concording authorities marked the completion of the sermon's outline. With so persistent a reliance on the quotation of the proper Scripture or saying at a suitable time, it is little wonder that the *florilegium* was so popular a reference tool in medieval preaching. Skilled preachers surely ransacked existing commonplace books to compile *florilegia* suited to their particular needs and styles. Less distinguished speakers probably acquired popular *florilegia* and relied upon them freely. The handbooks indicate that whenever a preacher wished to make an argument his first recourse was enthymeme (a rhetorical "proof"-- the counterpart to logic's syllogism) through authority. Classical rhetorical theorists might not have approved of so unvarying a practice; but then classical orators could not speak with the unchallenged authority of Scripture and the Fathers.

It has often been argued that the quotation of authority, or the unacknowledged paraphrasing of authority, was characteristic of all medieval writing. It pervaded the *inventio*, *dispositio*, and *elocutio* of almost every work of the period. But it must be noted that only in the preaching manuals does this medieval habit receive a full, analytical exposition. The thematic sermon seizes upon a traditional technique, elevates it to a crucially important position and acknowledges its lesser (and more common) employment, as well. The fact that medieval thematic sermons rely upon the citation of authority is not unique; the conscious theorizing about that reliance and the special quality of the sermonic use of authority are distinctive. The morality plays do not only partake of the general medieval habit of quoting authority. They also show the stamp of the sermon's special use of authority.

Contraries

A more complex sermon principle, discussed in some form in all preaching handbooks, is the use of contraries. I have selected this term to refer to several sermon practices described in the *artes praedicandi* and transferred it to the composition of the English morality plays. Unlike authority, contraries is not a foundation stone of the medieval sermon. But the consideration of contrary or opposing words and ideas seems to be an essential part of medieval preaching. Contraries dominates the *inventio* of the medieval sermon. Preachers are urged to write their sermons about opposing characters and qualities such as abstinence opposed to gluttony, or body versus soul, or life everlasting against eternal damnation.

The interest in contraries is also manifested in the arrangement of materials and arguments in the sermons. The handbooks often speak of a device they call "correction." A preacher corrects by introducing a digression on the consequence of not doing what he preaches, or conversely, of doing what he preaches against. Additionally, contraries and opposites are frequently listed in the handbook inventories of *dilatationes*. Preachers also used opposites to introduce authorities. They could relate an authority to a theme by presenting a contrary idea or by employing an antonym of some word in that theme. Finally, contraries is a main element in the sermon practice of distinction, a special, less formal, type of sermon division, and in many of the dilation techniques which are not specifically called contraries or opposites. That is to say, the unwieldy term "contraries" has been selected because it touches a key idea in a complicated sermon principle. The _artes praedicandi_ require opposition not only in the subject matter of the sermon but also in its structure; the use of contraries informs the invention and disposition and even the elocution of the medieval sermon.

The very arrangement of sample sermons in Alain of Lille's _Summa_ illustrates the way contraries dominates sermon invention. Alain's samples fall into two groups, sermons tailored for specific audiences and sermons on specific subjects. The sermon subjects first treat a series of vices, e.g., "Contra Gulam" (cols. 119-121); then they deal with virtue, e.g., "De Obedientia" (cols. 143-145). The transition sermon between these two series is appropriately entitled "De Spe Coelestium, et Contemptu Terrenorum" (cols. 135-136). Each sermon deals with the opposite of its topic and the whole, very traditional series is conceived of in terms of contrasting _topoi_. Indeed, the notion, "embrace virtue and seek salvation--abhor sin," is a controlling idea and the essential subject of almost all medieval sermon literature. With the exception of a small body of synodal sermons and perhaps a few sermons linked to specific religious observances this moral exhortation controls sermon invention. Even saints' day sermons, while praising the celebrated person, always attempt to draw applicable morals and models from the saint's life.

The theory behind Alain's sermon collection is presented by another early handbook author, Guibert of Nogent. Speaking especially of sermons for the laity, Guibert advises:

> Non magis autem de origine aut custodia virtutum, quam de concatenatione et fuga vitiorum fieri admonitio debet; ubi doctor quae sint naturalia et quae extra naturam vitia, quae etiam ex aliis generentur, et quam perniciosa ex seipsis et ex eis quae ab ipsis propagantur, sint, dum diligenter ac distincte docet, fructum immodicae utilitatis exhibet . . . .
>
> Dixi sane verumque dixi non minus prodesse aliquoties, si fiat tractatus de natura vitiorum, quam si fiat de natura virtutum. Si enim vitium non cognovero, quomodo sinceritatem virtutis amabo? Et vitium quomodo fugiam, nisi bonum, sanum et integrum aliquid, cujus adipiscendi ac fruendi gratia ipsum vitium fugiendum sit, sciam? . . .
>
> Debet itaque uniuscujusque vitii origo diligenter discuti, ut dum quid sit vitium aperte congoscitur, contrarium ejus, quod est virtus, quasi granum distinctum a palea evidentius, agnoscatur; et tanto studiosius vita, quod est virtus, ametur, quanto cautius vitium, quod est mors, evitatur. Nulla enim praedicatio salubrior mihi videtur quam illa quae hominem sibimet ostendat, et foras extra se sparsum in interiori suo, hoc est in mente, restituat atque eum coarguens quodammodo depictum ante faciem suam statuat.[20]

The opposition of virtue and vice is not only the most popular of sermon themes; for Guibert it is also the most useful and most effective.

Later handbooks devote less attention to the subjects appropriate to sermons than to the ways of writing good sermons. They still presume, however, that the topoi of opposition will dominate the sermon. The examples for division, distinction and dilation often touch on these ideas. But the later handbooks also make detailed suggestions on ways to incorporate the principle of contraries into sermon disposition. The clearest discussion of this trend occurs in the Pseudo-Aquinas tract where he speaks of "Correction":

---

[20] Guibert of Nogent, Liber quo Ordine Sermo Fieri Debeat in Patrologia Latina 156, cols. 26-27.

> The opposite meaning is in the form of correction. It should be used in every sermon in order that evils committed may not be deemed other than evil, and not be defended as though they were lawful.
>
> . . . in the contrary method of refutation, there should be set forth the evil losses which follow or can follow the possessor of a thing, or follow the thing, if it is evil in itself. But if it is a good thing, what will follow its opposite should be declared; to wit, the various inclinations to evil and the different vices caused by evil in a man. Finally, conclude by explaining how good or how bad the things become and which of them are the things by which people may be rendered blamable or praiseworthy.[21]

Pseudo-Aquinas' device is descended from the classical oratorical device of refutatio. Its parentage dates back to Priscian's grammar, which served as the principle composition textbook in English schools from the seventh to the sixteenth centuries.[22] Correction seems to have been popular among sermon theorists. It served as an antidote to distraction of listeners who became too involved in illustrative narratives, and it kept the focus of the sermon on its useful, moral ends.

---

[21] Pseudo-Aquinas, p. 82.

[22] Donald Leman Clark, "Rhetoric and the Literature of the English Middle Ages," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 45 (1959), 25.

Henry of Hesse also alludes to correction in his discussion of digressions.[23] William of Auvergne gives a terse restatement of Psuedo-Aquinas's remarks on correction:

> Contrariorum consideratio predicanti verbum Dei valde necessaria est. Multam enim copiam loquendi administrat. Nunquam ei verba poterunt in sermone deesse qui bene sciet contraria considerare. Quod patet sic. Incoepisti loqui de superbia. De humilitate ei opposita consequenter est loquendum, et sic de aliis secundum quod sibi invicem opponentur, ut verbi gratia, si predicasti de invidia et odio, de virtute caritatis, que invidie contraria est, loqui non obmittas. Item de abstinentia contra gulam, de continentia post luxuriam, de eleemosina post avaritiam continuo debes subiungere, quia contraria iuxta se posita pulcrius elucescunt.[24]

The handbooks make their most explicit references to contraries in their sections on dilatatio where they discuss uses of authority for confirming divisions. Christian Borgsleben, late in the fifteenth century, explains how contraries are a major method of developing the theme of a sermon:

> . . . promisi me velle dare modum faciendi introducciones ad populum vulgares, quibus mediantibus mens ingeniosa facile potest pervenire ad maiorem noticiam. Ubi est sciendum, quod volens facere unum praeambulum pro thematis illacione debet considerare tria in themate: principaliter videlicet sensum oppositum thematis . . . .

---

[23] Henry of Hesse, Tractatus . . . de Arte Praedicandi, ed. Harry Caplan, "'Henry of Hesse' On the Art of Preaching" PMLA, 48 (1933), 357.

[24] William of Auvergne, De Facibus Mundi, ed. A. de Poorter, "Un Manuel de prédication médiévale," Revue Néoscholastique de Philosophie, 25 (1923), 198.

Borgsleben follows this declaration with a lengthy but very helpful explanation of how contraries can be used to develop a theme. The passage, complete with its examples, deserves quotation:

> Exemplum de primo. Capiamus illud exemplum "Beati mortui." Pro cuius introduccione occurrit illus ps. "Mors peccatorum pessima." Hanc auctoritatem exponit beatus Bernhardus super ps. "benedicam Dominum" dicens: "Mors peccatorum" mala est in amissione mundi, quia non possunt sine dolore ab eo, quod diligunt, evelli, peior in dissolucione carnis, a qua evelluntur animae eorum a spiritibus immundis, pessima in tormentis inferni, quando corpus et anima perpetue adiciuntur ignibus. Econtra vero mors beatorum optima, quoniam post mortem fit requies a labore fit iucunditas, de novitate fit securitas de eternitate. Cum igitur tanta mala proveniant de malorum morte atque tanta bona de bonorum morte, congrue atque apte verba thematis inferuntur dicendo "Beati mortui." Attende, scolaris, iste modus introducendi innititur tali ymaginacioni, quando vis thema introducere per materiam oppositam themati, sicut hic fit in prima parte introduccionis, tunc recurre ad verbum oppositum verbo thematis. Exemplum: si vis isto modo introducere hoc thema "discite a me, quia mitis sum et humilis corde" Math. ij, vide primo oppositum huius verbi "discite," videlicet ignoranciam, et applica auctoritates, quibus ostendas, quam periculosum sit ignorare, et quae mala proveniunt ex ignorancia, postea positis huiusmodi dictis sanctorum sive doctorum infer: Ideo Salvator volens nos retrahere ab ignorancia dicit "discite" . . . . et sic patet per exempla, quod thema potest introduci per materiam aliquam oppositam verbis thematis, et de similibus simile est iudicium.[25]

Borgsleben is proposing that the sermon be expanded either by offering authorities whose sense is opposite to that of the theme or by offering authority containing antonyms to specific words in the theme.

---

[25] Christian Borgsleben of Erfurt, *Ars Praedicandi*, ed. Georg Buchwald, "Die Ars Praedicandi des Erfurter Franziskaners Christian Borgsleben," *Franziskanische Studien*, 1 (1921), 71-73.

XUM

Thomas Waleys recommends this method of adducing authorities:

> Una est ut auctoritas allegetur ad contrarium, eo modo quo allegat beatus Gregorius in prima homelia . . . Ecce quomodo beatus Gregorius, cum fecisset mentionem de justis et dixit quod scribuntur, adduxit auctoritatem ad contrarium, de injustis.[26]

Henry of Hesse also recommends adducing authorities containing antonyms.[27]

The final and least obvious of the handbook uses of opposites is based on a method of distinction, which is a sermon technique of varying status in preaching theory. For Pseudo-Bonaventure, who seems to introduce the term, it is a device of importance equal to division. For later theorists distinction is only a method of dilation; various kinds of distinctions often make up their inventories of _dilatationes_.

Pseudo-Bonaventure's treatment of distinction is quite helpful: "In primis circa hoc sciendum est diligenter, quod distinctiones, quae sunt in themate iam diviso, super thema fundentur, nec fiat digressio ab eodem; . . . .--Illud etaim sciendum circa distinctiones, quod oppositio fiat in membris et diversitas, ut unumquodque membrum suum sensum habeat.--Attendendum etiam, quod membrum distinctionis verbis, quibus potest paucioribus fiat; verbis, inquam, usitatis, ab intellectu non dissonis, sed rei, de qua loquitur, consonis . . . ."[28] The distinction is pursued in Pseudo-Bonaventure's discussion of _dilatatio_. _Describendo_ is one of eight methods of dilation; opposites is recommended as a means to clarify or describe the references of terms in the theme.

---

[26] Thomas Waleys, p. 385.

[27] Henry of Hesse, p. 357.

[28] Pseudo-Bonaventure, p. 16.

> Cum autem *describitur* aliquid, quod oppositum habet, convenienter potest se transferre praedicator ad eius oppositum, quoniam definitio unius oppositorum valet ad definitionem sumendam alterius. Posito ergo supradicto themate, et iustitia definita, convenienter potest se transferre praedicator ad alias species virtutis, ut scilicet ostendat, qualiter *prudentia* est in discernendo bona a malis et bona etiam a bonis, et magis bona a magis bonis, similiter magis mala a minus malis. Est enim *prudentia* bonarum rerum et malarum discretio . . . .--Ecce, qualiter ponendo orationem pro nomine facta est dilatatio, non solum notificando quod ponitur in themate, sed etiam alia notificando propter ipsum.--Non est autem conandum a praedicatore definitionem omnium vel descriptionem sumere indifferenter, sed maxime virtutum et vitiorum et specierum utriusque, donorum Spiritus sancti, religionis et contemplationis, liberi arbitrii et huiusmodi, quibus frequenter utitur theologia.[29]

The author also recommends opposites in his third *dilatatio*, *ratiocinando*:

> Tertius modus dilatandi est *ratiocinando* sive argumentando . . . . Inter omnes autem modos ratiocinandi in praedicatione tres mihi videntur praecipui, quibus praedicator magis debet uti: *unus* est de duobus contrariis vicissim ratiocinando, unum approbando et alterum reprobando quasi in demonstrativo genere causae; verbi gratia, si praedicator intendit probare, continentiam esse tenendam, transferat se ad luxuriam, ostendens eam reprobandam, et hoc multis rationibus . . . .[30]

Pseudo-Bonaventure's fondness for opposition is not unusual in the handbooks. The medieval preaching theorists found that words and ideas in sermons could be forcefully explained by resorting to contraries.

---

[29] Pseudo-Bonaventure, p. 17.

[30] Pseudo-Bonaventure, p. 18.

XUM

And when they wanted to expand a sermon they frequently resorted to distinguishing meanings or references in the words or arguments of their themes. Very often these distinctions were chosen because they bound up, under the explanation of a single word or phrase, a set of ideas and references which were paradoxical or at least ironic in their union of opposites. This richness gave the preacher a great deal of material to fill out his sermon.

The practice is evidenced as early as Alain de Lille. A passage in his sermon outline, "De Contemptu Sui," plays upon the opposition of words and ideas within a distinction:

> Noli jactare insignem habitum; quae enim gloria in velleribus ovium, et stercoribus vermium? Quae utilitas, lutum corporis praeparare, carnis sterquilinium deaurare? memorare igitur novissima tui, in libro scientiae, ut te legas in libro experientiae, ut te invenias in libro conscientiae: ut te reprehendat liber scientiae scriptus in codice, liber experientiae scriptus in corde. In libro scientiae legis: "Nosce te ipsum;" in libro experientiae legis: "Caro pugnat adversus spiritum (*Gal*.v);" in libro conscientiae legis: "Assiduis circumvolat alis,/Saeva dies animi." O homo! vide te in triplici speculo, et displicebis tibi. Triplex est speculum in quo te debes videre. Speculum Scripturae, speculum naturae, speculum creaturae. In speculo Scripturae legis statum tuum, in speculo creaturae videbis te miserum, in speculo tuae naturae considerabis te reum. In tua autem natura triplex resultat speculum, speculum rationis, sensualitatis et carnis . . . .[31]

In this passage Alain consciously juxtaposes the *liber scientiae*, *liber experientiae* and the *liber conscientiae*. The opposing tensions in this

---

[31] Alain of Lille, col. 118.

XUM

distinction are heightened with the parallel phrases, "scriptus in codice . . . scriptus in corde." The sense of opposition is confirmed when Alain moves on to the *speculum scripturae*, *speculum naturae*, and *speculum creaturae* in which the audience is also to "read" about the opposition of flesh and soul, salvation and damnation, and sensuality and reason.

William of Auvergne also employs this opposition through distinctions in an example he offers for his *dilatatio* titled "*distinctio*":

> Est autem distinctio diversarum acceptionum eiusdem dictionis ostensio, ut, verbi gratia, si occurrat mihi in sermone hoc nomen: *Pax*, vel *Gratia*, pluribus et diversis modis accipiam et ita distinguam. Est pax peccatoris, pax precatoris, pax temporis, pax eternitatis. Pax peccatoris, unde in Ps°: "Quia zelavi super iniquos, pace peccatorum videns." Hanc pacem non venit Dominus mittere in terram, sed magis gladium, id est huius male pacis destructionem. Pax precatoris, unde in Evangelio: "Pacem relinquo vobis," etc. Pax temporis, unde in libro Reg. Ezechias: tantum sit pax in diebus nostris. Pax eternitatis, unde: "In pace in idipsum dormiam", etc.[32]

He speaks of contraries again under "*Interpretatio*":

> Faciat ergo argumentum a contrariis prudens predicator . . . [e.g.,] Amaritudo, hoc est Maria, est mater salutis, ergo, per locum a contrariis, voluptas est mater perditionis.[33]

Contraries is also discussed as a method to formulate distinctions in the manuals of Martin of Cordova and Simon Alcok.[34]

---

[32] William of Auvergne, pp. 203-204.

[33] William of Auvergne, p. 205.

The nature of the subject matter with which the preachers constantly dealt and the pastoral objectives they shared in sermon writing led them to rely upon contraries, correction, and opposites to a very great extent. The evidence in the manuals argues that the reliance on contraries in all aspects of sermon writing was a habit of mind for the preachers. We shall see that the English morality playwrights shared this propensity.

Sermonic Voice

The whole body of *artes praedicandi* are in agreement on the nature of the preacher's relationship to his audience. I call the special posture assumed by the medieval preacher the sermonic voice. Throughout the history of the medieval sermon handbook this posture is specified in three ways. First, the theorists urge that the preacher be a good man. He must be beyond moral reproach and he must always preach with the needs and profit of his audience uppermost in his mind. These requirements, probably derived from the Roman rhetorical tradition of the *vir bonus,* make sermon arguments more believable and effective for a congregation. Second, the traditional form of the thematic sermon determines the quality of the relationship between a preacher and his listeners. Specific parts of the sermon, notably the protheme and prayer, set up a conventional rhetorical situation. That is, these parts of the *ars praedicandi* tradition seem intended to foster a particular rhetorical posture, or preacherly ethos, which I have termed the "sermonic voice." Their recurrent presentation in the handbooks argues for a rapport between preacher and congregation of a predictable quality. Finally, by studying the handbook discussions of *dilatatio* and introduction of theme, the manual writers' recommendations for implementing the sermonic voice can be discerned.

---

[34] Martin of Cordova, p. 340; Simon Alcok, *De Modo Dividendi Thema . . .*, ed. Mary F. Boynton, "Simon Alcok on Expanding the Sermon," *Harvard Theological Review*, 34 (1941), 213, *et passim*.

The handbooks do not employ Latin terms for sermonic voice, ethos, or audience rapport. But the *artes* were written as guides for practising orators; and they repeatedly acknowledge their debts to, e.g., Pseudo-Cicero's or Quintilian's rhetorical works. In this light, to assume that the preacher's voice was not a concern of the handbooks because it does not have a place in the traditional format or vocabulary of the manuals would be erroneous. These concerns are essential to the study and practice of oratory and the handbooks are based upon the Greek and Roman treatises which formulate the traditional principles of rhetoric. The very insistence by many handbook writers that preachers adapt the material and form of their sermons to the character of their audiences confirms this view.[35]

The insistence that a preacher be a *vir bonus* is part of every preaching handbook. Indeed, there is speculation that the forerunners of the

---

[35] Alain of Lille, cols. 184 ff.; Thomas Waleys, pp. 331-344, 373; Christian Borgsleben, pp. 71-72; William of Auvergne, p. 198; Humbert of Romans, *Treatise on Preaching*, trans. the Dominican Students, Province of St. Joseph, ed. W.M. Conlon (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1951), p.44.

XUM

artes praedicandi were treatises on the proper conduct of priests.[36] Since one of the functions of priesthood is preaching, it was logical that these works would touch upon the proper manner of preaching. When preaching became the main topic of the treatises, the original concerns of the works continued to show. Guibert of Nogent's remarks on the proper conduct of the preacher are typical of the early manuals.

> Simus igitur sanctae Ecclesiae membra, non mortua, sed congruum Dominico corpori officium reddentia, ut sicut in sacrosanctis mysteriis exterius peragendis sumus bonis consimiles, simus etiam introrsum, affectu et effectu totius pietatis aequales. Sit liber noster ex quo nostrae procedat textus orationis, pura conscientia, ne dum lingua aliis bona annuntiat, peccati memoria nos intus mordeat, quae locutionis impetum occulta confusione praepediat. Sermonem praecedat oratio, ut animus fervens amore divino ardenter, quae de Deo sentit, enuntiet, ut sicut apud se intrinsecus ardet, sic auditorum corda inflammet.[37]

Guibert argues that the preacher must be a good man with a clean conscience; otherwise his preaching will not be effective.

The most fully developed example of the vir bonus tradition in the manuals is Humbert of Romans's Treatise on Preaching. Humbert's treatise was written during the early part of the scholastic handbook era. He was the first general of the Dominican Order and wrote his manual for members of the new preaching order. Humbert devotes very little attention to the formal parts and arrangement of the sermon. Rather, he writes a "conduct book" for mendicant preachers. However, the objective of all his advice is to make the new friars the most useful and effective preachers possible. Preaching is a principal concern of this text; but the sermon itself is hardly discussed. The table of contents reveals Humbert's special interest: "1. The Qualities of this Office; 2. The Qualities Which the Preacher Charged with This Office Ought to Have; 3. How He Ought to Enter upon It; 4. The Exercise of Preaching; 5. The Ommission or Refusal of Preaching; 6. The Effects Which Preaching Produces; 7. A Few Points Connected with the Ministry of Preaching." In Chapter 2 Humbert discusses the proper conduct and study for preachers. In "The Preacher's Life" Humbert warns, "He ought to live a truly good life . . . . His life ought to be in harmony with his conscience, for a troubled conscience will prevent him from lifting up his voice fearlessly . . . . His life ought to be irreproachable; for how can he reproach others with what he himself is guilty of? . . . . Notice, however, that it does not suffice that the preacher's conduct be simply inoffensive. His life ought to be a shining light to all men and he should preach to them by word of mouth and, above all, by good example . . . ."[38] In addition, a preacher must be learned, eloquent, and scrupulously ethical in his conduct.[39]

---

[36] See, for example, the frequent classification of Gregory's Regula Pastoralis and Hrabanus Maurus' De Institutione Clericorum as artes praedicandi in, e.g., Dorothea Roth, Die mittelalterliche Predigttheorie und das Manuale Curatorum des Johann Ulrich Surgant; Basler Beiträge zur Geschichtswissenschaft, 58 (Basel: Helbrin and Lichtenhan, 1956), pp. 15-31.

[37] Guibert of Nogent, col. 24.

---

[38] Humbert of Romans, pp. 37-38.

[39] Hubert of Romans, pp. 38-47.

After Humbert's treatise, almost all edited handbooks until the fifteenth century are attributable to Dominicans or Franciscans. Appropriately, the manual tradition has become the property of the preaching orders. The approaches of Alain, Guibert of Nogent, Augustine, and surely those of other unknown preaching theorists are grafted to Humbert of Romans' conduct book. Every complete manual now includes two parts: a discussion of how the preacher must behave and a presentation of the parts of the sermon. A concern for the ethos of the priest has been firmly attached to the theory of preaching by the end of the thirteenth century. All handbooks now argue that not only must the preacher be eloquent, learned, and persuasive; he must also come before his congregation as an exemplar of whatever virtues he may urge upon his hearers.

This preacherly ethos is a complex one. The preacher who is a moral exemplar and a vir bonus must also be the servant of his congregation, an intermediary for them with God, and a servant of God. Preaching theory requires the preacher to achieve a difficult blend of humility and power. Sermon theorists are aware of the anomalous posture the preacher must assume and the discussions of suitable prothemes and prayers in the handbooks reveal how they expected the preacher to cope with this problem. It is significant that the only sermon parts discussed in Humbert's treatise are the protheme and the prayer. Since his concern is the proper conduct of the preacher and the ethos which that fosters, Humbert's judgment seems to confirm my claim that these parts of the sermon were particularly important for the creation of a proper sermonic voice.

However, the medieval handbook writers appear never to have fully agreed on the purpose of the protheme. As a result, there are a variety of names for the protheme; each speaks to a slightly different function. Some call it the antetheme, others call it the prelocution, the *exordium*, or the *captatio benevolentiae*. Not all handbook writers regard the protheme as an *exordium* wherein the preacher warms his audience and lays the groundwork for the tone of his sermon. Many theorists only regard the protheme as a digression or elaboration upon the theme. But enough view it as a rhetorical device to merit its inclusion in a discussion of sermonic voice.

Alain of Lille alludes to the way in which the protheme can capture the interest and good will of a sermon audience:

> Consequenter, praedicator debet captare benevolentiam auditorum a propria persona per humilitatem, et a rei quam proponit utilitate, dicendo, se iis proponere verbum Dei, ut fructum faciat in mentibus eorum, non ad terrenum emolumentum, sed ad provectum et profectum eorum . . . .[40]

William of Auvergne agrees that the protheme has this rhetorical function; but his view of its purpose is slightly different: ". . . in exordio sermonis auxilium Dei invocare debes et ad orandum pro te inducere auditores . . . ."[41]

Humbert's discussion of the protheme is the most thorough:

> In these exordia or preambles, we must be brief, for if we weary our listeners, it will prove detrimental to the rest of our sermon.
> The exordium should be pleasing, so as to prepare our

---

[40] Alain of Lille, col. 113.

[41] William of Auvergne, p. 197.

> audience to listen with attention, good-will, and docility . . . .
> The theme of the exordium may refer to the person of the preacher, for instance when the preacher is a religious . . . .
> Or the exordium may be inspired by a consideration of the audience to whom the sermon is addressed. One may recommend to them, for example, that they should not only listen to, but especially practice what is going to be preached to them . . . .
> Also, the exordium may be taken from the subject of the sermon about to be preached . . . .
> Finally, the inspiring thought of the exordium can be drawn from the end of preaching itself. For example, it can be shown that preaching has for its unique end the production of real fruits . . . .[42]

Later handbooks are careful to stress the unity of the sermon. Attention is devoted to the smooth movement from part to part. In keeping with this viewpoint, Thomas Waleys presents the protheme as an introduction to the sermon's prayer. The protheme exhorts the audience to pray for its salvation and for the preacher's salvation, for a good sermon and for the spiritual profit of the audience.[43]

The prayer always followed the protheme and it was in this sermon part that the conventional preacher-audience rapport was most firmly established. The good will and interest generated by the protheme are confirmed in the prayer. While leading the congregation in prayer, the preacher assumed his special role as spiritual peer of the congregation, moral exemplar, spokesman of the Word of God, and intermediary between parishioner and God. The rhetoric of prayer was so great a concern to

---

[42] Humbert of Romans, pp. 156-159.

[43] Thomas Waleys, p. 349.

XUM

medieval preachers that some of them prepared treatises on the ars orandi. William of Auvergne's De Faciebus is an often cited example of such a prayer handbook. The preaching manuals always discuss this aspect of the preacher's ethos.

Jean of Galles is the first author to argue that the prayer and protheme are addressed to both the audience and to God.[44] William of Auvergne makes a similar argument for a double addressee in this part of the sermon.[45] But, again, it is Humbert of Romans who gives fullest expression to the special preacherly posture in the sermon. He characteristically notes that the prayer is actually for the benefit of the preacher's soul. Speaking of the eternal rewards which accrue to a devout preacher, Humbert observes, "There is no doubt that . . . listeners devoutly pray . . . for those who preach to them, especially when the harbingers of God's Kingdom are in the habit of beseeching this prayerful remembrance either at the beginning or at the end of their sermons . . . ."Humbert concludes that the preacher must seek the prayers of His audience to achieve the proper tone of address. "As it is very difficult to have always the right manner of speech, the Apostle, St. Paul addressing the Colossians begged them to pray for him: 'Pray for us also, that God may give us an opportunity for the word to announce the mystery of Christ . . . . that I may openly announce it as I ought to speak.' (Col. 4:3)"[46] Some later handbook writers share Humbert's interest in the prayer. Francesc Eiximenis urges the preacher to pray before his sermon begins. His prayer should dedicate his preaching to Christ and ask that he avoid error in his sermon.[47]

---

[44] Roth, p. 85.

[45] William of Auvergne, p. 197.

[46] Humbert of Romans, p. 73.

There is a uniformity of opinion among handbook writers that the preacher must ask for God's grace and for the prayers and indulgence of the congregation before he begins to preach. Although probably muted by its ritual usage, the effect of this prayer on the relation of the preacher to his congregation is extraordinary. The conduct book *artes praedicandi* are eloquent in their counsel to preachers that they must be exemplary Christians. Humbert of Romans and Hugh of St. Victor go into considerable detail in their warnings. For preaching to be effective, preachers must beware of losing the respect of their congregations. Yet in the prayer which must accompany every sermon, the preacher is explicitly directed to abandon any possible superiority he may wish to maintain over his audience. He is still the mediator of God's Word for his listeners; but for his sermon to be successful the congregation must ask grace for their leader. Dorothea Roth takes note of this phenomenon in her discussion of Thomas Waleys's treatment of prayer in *De Modo Componendi Sermones*. Thomas, using Solomon and Plato as authorities, argues that the sermon's subject matter and the preacher's task are so lofty that the preacher should not ask for wisdom in his prayer but rather should seek divine aid.[48] The theorists of medieval sermon rhetoric were of

---

[47] Francesc Eiximenis, p. 316.

[48] Roth, p. 108; Thomas Waleys, p. 331.

XUM

course aware that such requests for prayers for the preacher tacitly reminded the congregation that its cooperation was also required for the preacher's success. Some sermon theorists do suggest that the preacher tell the audience it must be receptive to the preacher's sermon and must then act upon the advice it has received. However, the traditional sermon wisdom prefers for the preacher to efface himself by drawing the congregation's attention to his own frailty and then beseeching its aid in overcoming that weakness. Rather than creating an oratorical scene where a speaker of great authority tells an audience what it should do, the sermon's prayer entices the audience into a cooperative spiritual venture led by a fellow Christian of considerable learning. The import of this prescribed rhetorical posture has great significance for the entire tradition of medieval devotional literature and for the morality play in particular.

Once a preacher fulfilled the conventional requirements for the sermonic voice he had several options available for its development in the body of his sermon. In one sense, the catalogue of dilatationes appended to the preaching manuals enumerated his tools. The radical reliance on authority in the design and elaboration of thematic sermons inevitably stressed the preacher's learnedness and familiarity with the Word of God and the teaching of the Church. The preacher could further enhance his image of learnedness through the subtlety and complexity of his divisions and the employment of apt concordances of both a real and verbal sort. Or he could employ the syllogism and other tools of university disputation to make his sermon points. The handbooks unanimously discourage learned

XUM

display in sermons preached to the laity, however.[49] Instead, they encourage preachers to use *narratio* or *historia* in the introduction of the theme and the expansion of the popular sermon. The objectives of such devices are often to catch the attention of the congregation through the presentation of an *exemplum*, fable, or other story and to make a moral point by means of the narration. The preference for *narratio* in sermon dilation fosters a particular method for realizing a preacher's sermonic voice.

Thomas Waleys singles out narration as one of two ways to introduce a theme. The introduction is a sermon part created in the later thirteenth-century handbooks; it follows the prayer. The preacher's introduction explains the importance of his theme and sketches the lessons to be drawn from it. The introduction could be regarded as the statement of intent for the "*prosecutio*" or development of the remainder of the sermon. Thomas Waleys calls his two methods *modus narrativus* and *modus argumentativus*. He quickly cautions that the *modus narrativus* does not prohibit the use of argument; it simply does not rely upon syllogistic reasoning to introduce the theme. Thomas briefly defines the method and then offers an example:

> Fit igitur introductio . . . duobus modis. Et in primo quidem modo, scilicet narrativo, thema non infertur ex deductione praecedenti tanquam conclusio sequens ex ipso; immo potius confirmat ipsam vel aliquam ejus partem, vel alium modum habet connexionis cum ipsa. [Thomas offers an example:] Nam si, praedicaturus de Spiritu Sancto, accipiam istud thema: *Spiritus Sanctus quem mittet Pater in nomine meo docebit vos*. Joan. 14; et volo introducere ipsum solum modo narrativo, dicam sic: Secundum doctrinam Philosophi, libro *Ethicorum*, filii a parentibus tria

---

[49] Thomas Waleys, p. 344; Francesc Eiximenis, p. 304.

XUM

> recipiunt, scilicet esse, et hoc fit per generationem, nutrimentum, et hoc fit per sollicitam provisionem, disciplinam, et hoc fit per congruam instructionem. Parentes autem nostri, seu parens noster, est Deus Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus. Et quamvis indivisa sunt opera Trinitatis, tamen, secundum quamdam appropriationem, recipimus esse spirituale et divinum a Deo Patre per generationem spiritualem, quae facit nos Dei filios adoptivos. Jac. 1: _Omne datum optimum et omne donum perfectum desursum est, descendens a Patre luminum . . . ._ Ecce quod in ista deductione proceditur modo narrativo, sic quod ipsum thema non elicitur ex ipsa deductione tanquam conclusio sequens; immo magis adducitur ad confirmandum praecedens, eo modo quo adducuntur aliae auctoritates.[50]

The _modus narrativus_ is not storytelling; the term is not cognate to our sense of the word narrative. Nonetheless, there is a difference between the narrative and argumentative methods which is important for understanding the sermonic voice. The preacher who employs the _modus narrativus_ does not rely upon reason. His persuasion depends upon the enthymeme. The distinctions offered in Thomas' example are neither complete nor logically infallible. They work because of the flow of the presentation, their aptness as images, and the use the preacher makes of them. Introducing a theme by the narrative method permits the preacher to arrange and interpret the matter of his sermon to serve his specific didactic ends. He never relinquishes his obvious control of the ordering and presentation of material. That is, the _modus narrativus_ is a rhetorical technique; the _argumentativus_ relies on the more impersonal logical tools of disputation to persuade.

The terms _narrativus_ and _historia_ recur in treatises which discuss introduction of themes and dilation. Their meaning is not uniform in the handbooks. For many writers narrative simply refers to the portion of the sermon where the theme is developed (the *prosecutio*). Henry of Hesse offers the best example of this use of the term. Henry speaks of four general figures to be used in every sermon. They are the four senses of Scriptural exegesis. The literal sense he calls *historice*; he equates it with *narratio*: "Prima dicitur hystoria et est simplex litteralis sensus interpretatio, ut cum Evangelium vulgarisatur. Et dicitur hystoria ab hysteron Grece, quod est gesticulatio Latine, quasi geste rei narratio, unde gestum, id est, factum."[51] Later Henry discusses the various traditional methods of preaching and describes the oldest method. It has but two parts, the *historia* and the *postillatio*. Henry is attempting to divide the presentation of the sermon's theme from the conclusions to be drawn from it.

---

[50] Thomas Waleys, pp. 358-359.

Henry's use of the term narrative is common; but his apparent separation of narrative and postilla is unusual. Other theorists acknowledge that the exposition of the theme and its interpretation are most often done in swift sequence or simultaneously. Francesc Eixemenis urges the preacher to move his audience with *historiae* or saints' lives and then draw a moral: "Et ut plus moueantur corda audiencium et maior fructus in omni sermone fiat, tam uite sanctorum quam euangeliorum historie, quecumque allegoria siue profecto allegata diuinas siue quodcumque tractatur, finaliter trahatur ad mores."[52] Martin of Cordova proposes ten methods of introducing a theme. One is "per ystorie narrationem." It is especially recommended for the unlearned audience because it will engage their interest:

---

[51] Henry of Hesse, p. 345.

> Tertius modus per ystorie narrationem, ut si accipis thema ex Ewangelio, potes introducere recitando totam ystoriam Ewangelii, et iste est bonus pro rusticis qui delectantur in istis narrationibus. Ego ipse quando contigit me transire per eos et predicare, non teneo alium modum nisi accipio verbum de Ewangelio, et sine alia subtilitate recito ystoriam, interponendo aliquas moralitates, et sic concludo thema.[53]

It is Simon Alcok who offers the clearest insight into how the preacher makes historia work for him. Alcok's treatise is a peculiar, perhaps fragmentary, one; it deals only with dilatatio. There is no discussion of a preacher's proper conduct, the selection of themes or the parts of a sermon. However, the discussion of the device historia is unusually long and full. It stresses the significance of a conclusion or point to be made in the narration of a story. In so doing it provides the clearest evidence for the operation of sermonic voice in preaching. When Alcok discusses historia, he abandons the sterile format used for most dilatationes where a few examples are merely outlined. For historia, he considers the design of the sermon as a whole. According to Alcok, it is a rhetorical construct wherein the preacher determines his conclusions, sets them out at the beginning and then proves them through the proper presentation and interpretation of historiae, auctoritates, or other dilatationes.

---

[52] Francesc Eiximenis, p. 15.

[53] Martin of Cordova, p. 335.

XUM

The conclusions, which are the rhetorical objectives of the speech, are to dominate the disposition of the sermon.

Alcok introduces historia by suggesting that it can encompass the whole of a sermon; he then makes his point about the importance of subsuming historiae to predetermined conclusions or arguments to be carried to the congregation:

> Ad dividendum thema ponendo totam materiam sermonis in certis historiis exponendis, sicut applicando cuilibet principali unam principalem historiam in cuius expositione et dilatatione stet tota materia principalis, multum iuvat scire convenienter inducere tales historias. Pro quo potest notari quod una via inducendi historiam convenienter fit per conclusionem generalem concernentem materiam totius historie aut aliquid notabile in historia, aut aliter intentum finale ipsius historie. Qua conclusione presupposita, debet talis historia induci ad probandam vel ad confirmandam istam conclusionem.[54]

In the example which he cites just after this passage, Alcok counsels the preacher to first state his three conclusiones and then to prove (probari) them with three stories "in quarum expositione et dilatatione potest stare materia sermonis." The stories constitute the bulk of such a sermon. More examples follow and Alcok then tells the preacher to color his stories so that they carry the force of his conclusions in an effective manner: "Et sic possunt notari in hac historia [discussed in the preceding example] illa que conveniunt et moralizari ad prelatos [an allegorical application of a figure in the example], intermiscendo auctoritates doctorum et scripture ad propositum pertinentes."[55] That is, the narrative is not to continue without applicatio or other pointed, instructive interruptions.

---

[54] Simon Alcok, p. 211.

Alcok climaxes his discussion of historia by urging preachers to use all other dilatationes to further the ends of the arguments. While not so proclaimed, this part of Alcok's treatise seems to be the keystone to his notion of preaching theory: "Et sicut fit introductio ad historiam proponendo conclusionem cum nota similitudinis. Ita potest fieri per notam prepositionis sicut in, per, ad, super, et huiusmodi [dilatationes discussed elsewhere in the treatise] . . . ." Alcok then continues with another caution that historia, most of all, be subordinate to the arguments of the preacher: "Sed quasi pro maiore parte videtur, observandum quod quando aliqua historia prolixa vel brevis, vel aliqua auctoritas scripture est introducenda in predicatione, debet aliqua oratio vel conclusio precedere que confirmanda, ostendenda, vel probanda est per talem historiam vel auctoritatem sequentem."[56] In these passages Simon Alcok presents a sermon which is largely occupied by historiae and their elaboration and dilation, but which devotes most of its rhetorical strength to a proof of conclusions through those dilatationes.

Such a view of the sermon encourages the manipulation of a narration to suit the preacher's instructional ends. The narrative, whether it introduced a theme in a sermon by Thomas Waleys or dominated one by Simon Alcok, was never intended to be simple entertainment which dealt with morally uplifting subject matter. Instead, it fit into a rhetorically conceived framework whose objective was useful instruction in faith and morals. Stories were told with a special didactic intent--to move their hearers to upright living and move them to look to their last ends. The preacher kept his *conclusiones* uppermost in his presentation of a narrative. Indeed, the entire *prosecutio* of his theme was designed to convey the importance and validity of his main points.

---

[55] Simon Alcok, pp. 211-212.

[56] Simon Alcok, p. 212.

These findings are not surprising in a survey of the medieval theory of preaching. The principles of authority, contraries, and sermonic voice are obvious in the sermons of the era and they are not very different from the assumptions and methods of modern preaching. They are, however, principles, articulated in medieval documents expressly designed for preachers, which are unique to sermon technique. The fact that they can be clearly demonstrated to be preaching methods is important to the following chapters of this dissertation. I do not wish to argue that the presence of authority, contraries, and sermonic voice in the morality plays merely indicates that the works are rhetorical constructs. Instead, I wish to argue that the techniques of preaching, which apply the useful and persuasive objectives of rhetoric to the accomplishment of a particular sermonic end, dominate the invention and arrangement of the plays. That is, the plays are not only rhetorical; they also show the clear influence of the techniques of sermon rhetoric.

PART II: Introduction

The Morality Plays and the Ars Praedicandi

While only three topics have been chosen for consideration in this section, there are more than three ways in which sermon theory probably influenced the morality drama. But the present study cannot attempt to be comprehensive; instead an effort has been made to select and study a few representative examples of sermon-morality play interrelationships. Scholars have given little attention to the influence of sermon theory on morality drama, although sermon *topoi* employed in these plays are well chronicled. The present writer desires only to suggest several avenues of possible inquiry and to confirm the presence of the citation of authority, the use of contraries, and the employment of a sermonic voice in the morality plays.

Critics who approach the morality plays with formalistic interests have occasionally suggested sermon parallels in the plays. Their attention almost always goes to the prologues and epilogues and the critics generally conclude that the morality plays are dramatized sermons. Introductory and closing passages are arranged around a temptation scene which serves as an *exemplum*.[1] Dorothy Wertz has examined the theology of the plays and concluded that their staging was frequently designed to demonstrate doctrinal principles. One of her perceptive suggestions is that God, in the *Castel of Perseverance*, probably sat on His open scaffold throughout the play. His overseeing presence conveyed the nominalist "dome" theory of God's role in human affairs (potentia absoluta over potentia ordinata). Wertz concludes that the plays are dramatized doctrinal arguments.[2] Bernard Spivack offers one of the most interesting commentaries on the sermonic characteristics of the moralities:

---

[1] Sister Christian Koontz, "A Stylistic Analysis of the Morality Play 'Wisdom Who is Christ,'" Diss. The Catholic University 1971, p. 139; J.J. Molloy, *A Theological Interpretation of the Moral Play, "Wisdom Who is Christ"* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Univ. Press, 1952), pp. 200-201.

> In addition to [the plays'] metaphorical action they invariably are equipped with a complex apparatus of exposition and carry onto the stage the method of direct discourse and exhortation employed by a preacher toward his congregation . . . .
>
> Each of the plays furnishes abundant internal evidence for the clerical origin of this whole dramatic genre and, what is still more important, illustrates the unique dramatic method specialized to fulfill on stage the purposes of homiletic allegory. The metaphorical action remains a text with universal application, the stage remains a pulpit, and the audience, as they are frequently denominated by the plays themselves, remain a "congregation"--always within the homiletic consciousness of the play and the players, and subject at any moment to direct admonitory address.[3]

Spivack argues that the plays were conceived of as sermons and often deviate into simple sermonic forms of discourse. Such scholarly attention to the non-topical interrelationships of sermon practice and morality dramaturgy has been sketchy and unsystematic.

I perceive seven ways in which sermon practice could have influenced morality play composition. Each of these means certainly affected the plays; but some had more influence on the ultimate design of the works than others. Most critical remarks dealing with the influence of sermon design on the plays suggest that the moralities actually are sermons. Their shared material and clearly didactic intentions seem to support such a view. But this is too simplified an approach; it overlooks elements in the plays which reflect the authors' attention to purely dramatic concerns. And it does not offer any insight into how the plays are sermons. To simply point out the presence of sermon parts or sermon practices in the morality plays does not entitle a critic to call these works sermons. An alternative view notes the presence of sermonettes within the plays. The prologues and epilogues are favored examples of miniature sermons; the speeches of the vices and virtues in the battle scene of *Castel of Perseverance* are also often cited. I agree that there are speeches in every morality play which have the spiritual instruction of a fellow character or the audience as their end. These lines often also display styles of argument and organization proposed in the *artes praedicandi*.

---

[2] Dorothy Wertz, "The Theology of Nominalism in the English Morality Plays," Harvard Theological Review, 62 (1969), 373.

[3] Bernard Spivack, Shakespeare and the Alleory of Evil (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1958), pp. 109, 113.

A more fruitful account of sermon-play similarities argues that the two forms share matter and intent. It is indisputable that common *exempla* and common allegorical methods and characterizations occupy both sermons and plays. The theological and pastoral interests of the two forms are also similar. Alain of Lille's popular definition of preaching, "*morum et fidei instructio*" (col. 112), is realized on the morality stage as well as in the pulpit. The forms also share the *topoi* of fifteenth-century devotional literature. The *danse macabre*, *ars moriendi*, and *psychomachia* are often rehearsed in the sermons and are fundamental elements in morality play design. In addition, both sermon and drama show the influence of late medieval English devotional writers, as well as the impact of similar continental authors. But these *materiae* are not generally discussed in the *ars praedicandi* tradition. Only the oldest and most fundamental of sermon *topoi*, the *psychomachia*, is regularly considered in the handbooks. And such treatment regards the trope only as a readily available subject matter for demonstration sermons.

More useful to the present study is an examination of how sermon devices, mostly *dilatationes*, are used in playwriting. This level of influence is probably the most profitable of any to study. If the morality play authors were preachers, the transfer of sermon technique to playwriting was probably greatest at this point. Simple borrowing of techniques would not require a conscious decision by an author to create a dramatized sermon; nor need any conflicts between artistic and rhetorical ends arise. But the transfer of *dilatationes* to play making would influence the design of the moralities largely on the level of *elocutio*. If a playwright chose to use etymological analysis in his drama the essential argument or plan of the work would probably be unaffected. The present section examines a very popular *dilatatio* device which was also used in the plays. The device, authority, is not a simple one. Nor, as one would expect, is the device limited to *elocutio* in its application in the plays. Authority was a crucially important tool in the thematic sermon. It is correspondingly plentiful in the plays. A second *dilatatio*, contraries, will also be examined in the following chapters. The dramatists' use of this device is even more varied and complex than their use of authority. There are a few uncomplicated transfers of sermon techniques to the moralities. Characters will engage in causal analysis, there are occasional examples of thematic division, and prayer is often used in the plays in a manner similar to the preacher's use of prayer. But the more interesting

XUM

transfers of technique are not simple nor are they easily classified.

The transfigurations worked on sermon devices applied in playwriting confound the classification problem noted in the *ars praedicandi* treatments of *dilatatio*. In the previous chapter it was observed that contraries and authority were more basic to sermon practice than their classification as *dilatationes* in the later handbooks would admit. Authority was a fundamental resource in the argument of the thematic sermon. Contraries was essential to the very traditions from which the preachers drew their materials. The plays elevate the device of contraries to the level of a principle of design in the morality genre. The kind of meaning peculiar to the morality plays requires that forces of good and evil arrange themselves in opposition to one another. The plots invariably relate the vacillation of man between these two extremes. Contraries, a technique of dilation in the plays and a frequent tool in morality play *dispositio* and *elocutio*, is also a crucial element in the *inventio* of these dramas.

While some sermon devices served the plays as compositional principles, not all the tools of the pulpit could command a central place in morality dramaturgy. Some sermon devices were adapted to the needs and ends of the dramatist. Even contraries and authority are sometimes employed in a manner which is divorced from their sermon functions. Such a thorough appropriation of pulpit usage may be detected by a careful reader but its identification is not of great use in the present study.

The seventh and most probable way in which sermon theory may have influenced morality play composition is that dramatic and sermonic elements

XUM

coëxisted in the plays through the design of the authors. The playwright chose to invoke clearly identifiable sermon practices to achieve the didactic objectives of his drama. His transfer of sermon technique to the plays was not accidental. Rather, the playwright had sermonic goals in mind for his play and manifested his intentions by using tools familiar to both himself and his audience. It was easy for the writer to use tried devices; his audience, already exposed to the material and technique of the morality plays through the pulpit, supported the didactic ambitions of the writer through its recognition of the sermonic elements in the dramas. While more entertaining than a pulpit sermon, a dramatized sermon was still instruction in faith and morals. But the preacher-playwright also employed techniques common to sermon writing for entirely dramatic, non-rhetorical ends.

A good example of the intentional interpolation of sermon practice into the dramatic frame will be discussed under the term "sermonic voice." It will be argued that morality playwrights did not compose dramas in the conventional definition of the term. Their intent was never to show the free, mimetic interaction of characters on a stage. The morality play, rather, always maintained the presence of a non-dramatic preacher-narrator who exercised control over the tone and content of all the speeches in the play. The product of such a sermonic, rhetorically conceived control over the mimetic aspects of the moralities poses a problem for the critic of literature. Are the plays literary objects created only for contemplation in themselves or are they rhetorical constructs using mimetic enactment to achieve a preacherly end?

I believe that the plays must be regarded as rhetoric, although there are elements of formal design in some of the works which entirely overpower any useful or persuasive purposes. The critical acclaim given *Everyman* is good argument that dramatic and poetic concerns dominate the strong instructional interests of this play. However, the important point is that the argumentative, instructional interests are too strong in all the moralities to be ignored. These plays are not poetic expositions of doctrinal notions, like the fourteenth-century English masterpiece, *Pearl*; they are works of persuasion cloaked in drama. For this reason, I have determined to classify the quality of influence which authority, contraries, and sermonic voice exercise in morality play design according to the Roman rhetorical categories of *inventio*, *dispositio*, and *elocutio*. These terms, though first used in theoretical treatises on public speaking, have often been used since Horace to apply to the processes in poetic design as well. The use of rhetorical terms in dramatic criticism is especially convenient for the present writer who admits the conviction that the morality plays have strong rhetorical elements. The distinctions have also been borrowed from the Roman rhetoricians, because medieval writers themselves distinguished between *elocutio* and other parts of literary craftsmanship. The bane of modern critics has been that most medieval literary theorists showed little concern for those "other parts." By keeping the Roman distinctions before us it may be possible to avoid preoccupation with the devices of *elocutio* which are so thoroughly discussed in *artes grammaticae* and *artes dictaminis*. This study was undertaken to determine whether sources for principles of morality play invention and disposition could be found in the *artes praedicandi*. The following discussions of authority, contraries, and sermonic voice offer evidence that the preaching handbooks were propaedeutic to morality dramaturgy.

CHAPTER III: The Use of Authority in the Morality Plays

The use of authority in the morality drama demonstrates a particular mode of technical borrowing practised by the fifteenth-century English preacher-playwrights. Citation of authority was a fundamental device in medieval sermon practice. A sermon's theme, its key authority, determined the design of the entire work. The supporting, confirming, or concording authorities fleshed out the sermon argument, made the preacher's point convincing, and lent a learned gravity to the speaker's words. Authority, especially Scriptural authority, could be regarded as the very stuff from which a medieval sermon was created. The morality drama first strikes its modern reader as being sermon-like by virtue of a similar frequency of Scriptural quotation. But just as the preachers employed authority in a variety of different ways, so the dramatists worked among the many sermonic uses of authority and selected and modified a few devices to suit their needs. There seem to be three major reasons for citing authority in the moralities. A playwright has a doctrinal intent, a literary intent, or a desire to establish or modulate the character of one of the players. Authority is not cited with equal frequency by the playwrights. Nor are all the categories and subdivisions of its use practised with uniform skill. But it is still more significant that authority does not have the crucial importance in the morality play which it enjoys in sermon theory. For the *ars praedicandi* writer the selection of a theme and the determination of its divisions accomplished most of the task of rhetorical invention. The marshalling of subordinate authorities sometimes achieved much of the disposition and expression of the sermon; but the *artes* *praedicandi* agreed that once the preacher had selected his authorities his sermon was virtually complete.[1] The morality playwright did not rely upon authority in such a manner. Instead, he used it in ways more nearly equivalent to the preacher's secondary employment of Scripture for organization and expression (*dispositio* and *elocutio*) in his plays. Authority was not the chief tool of the morality dramatist. It was, however, a device which found great and quite diversified use among the fifteenth-century playwrights.

The *artes praedicandi* writers rely on authority, in the form of Scripture, for the sermon theme. The theme, or topic statement, was traditionally regarded as the root or seed of the medieval sermon. It was usually a brief Scriptural citation which theoretically contained the entirety of the sermon; the preacher only manifested its content. His options for unravelling the theme varied according to the nature of his audience. He could divide it into words or phrases to be explicated; or he could use more complex division methods which analyzed the "causes" of the quotation or its grammatical complexities. Divisions, regardless of their sophistication, relied, like the theme, upon the citation and analysis of authority. The medieval thematic sermon is basically a series of Scriptural quotations followed by appropriate divisions. When repeated in serial and subordinated sequences, all with ultimate reference to the main thematic authority, a group of properly chosen quotations could constitute an adequate sermon for a congregation of any level.

---

[1] It should be acknowledged in this regard that the handbooks distinguish between the problems a preacher faces in making a sermon and those he faces in delivering an effective sermon. For example, when Thomas Waleys argues that the principal work of sermon writing follows the introduction of the theme (p. 386) he is referring to the sermon as an instructive discourse. Other less comprehensive treatise writers keep the unpractised preacher in mind. For such a reader the main work of making the sermon lies in selecting a theme and making suitable divisions. The work of *dilatatio* is easier; there are many devices from which to choose and the posibility of literary misinterpretation or doctrinal error is much smaller.

XUM

The first subordinate use of authority in the medieval sermon is the protheme. It does not bear directly upon the preacher's intended interpretation of the theme but it may offer the congregation a background idea or a context for the lesson to be developed from the theme. Subsequent uses of authority generally serve either as miniature themes for analysis of the divisions of the main theme or as supporting authorities for points made within the division-subdivision frame of the sermon. Both of these uses are termed "concordance" by the _artes praedicandi_ writers.

The handbooks take for granted the double function of authority. They use one word, "_auctoritas_," to refer to both the Scriptural theme of the sermon and the supporting authorities employed in division and dilation. So Martin of Cordova defines theme as a central authority: ". . . thema est breuis et autentica autoritas, super quam fundatur propositum et ex qua processus sermonis trahit originem. Unde sic se habet thema ad sermonem sicut vas ad edificium, sicut radix ad arborem, . . . sicut caput ad membra."[2] Martin's architectural concept of the theme is given a more abstract representation in the treatise by Francesc Eiximenis. Whereas Martin stresses that the theme contains the ideas to be developed in the sermon, Francesc also attempts to represent the practical and technical relevance of the theme to sermon design:

> Si uis ordinate inuenire materiam predicandam, recurre ad ordines, ubi aduerte quod uolens inuestigare materiam predicabilem debes quasi in centro circuli ponere thema uel illam materiam de qua uis predicare . . . .[3]

---

[2] Martin of Cordova, p. 332.

[3] Francesc Eiximenis, p. 323.

I believe that Francesc Eiximenis's treatment of the place of the thematic authority in sermon writing is more representative of the attitude of the medieval handbook writers.

Thomas Waleys shares Francesc Eiximenis's more pragmatic approach to authority. Like his fellow handbook writers he uses the term "auctoritas" to refer to both theme and concording citations. In addition, Thomas speaks of the sermon as a network of quotations which all refer to, expand, and enhance the statement of the theme. Thomas offers a comprehensive discussion of authority at the beginning of his chapter on dilatatio (Chapter IX):

> . . . dilatationis multiplex est modus et multiplex etiam occasio. Quantum ad modum dilatandi, est ista diversitas, nam quidam in dilatando se utuntur solum auctoritatibus vel Sacrae Scripturae, vel aliorum doctorum catholicorum, et quandoque philosophorum gentilium, praecipue qui de morali scientia scripserunt, sicut Tullii, seu Senecae, vel aliorum qui aliqua verba moralia suis operibus miscuerunt; ita quod isti procedunt de auctoritate ad auctoritatem quasi continue usque ad finem prosecutionis illius membri divisionis vel distinctionis seu pluralitatis acceptionis cui immorantur. Finalis autem auctoritas talis prosecutionis consuevit esse aliqua auctoritas Sacrae Scripturae quae vocaliter conveniat cum themate, et cum illo vocabulo thematis propter quod fit tota prosecutio hujus. Et istud etiam observatur, in omni modo praedicandi et procedendi tacto in praecedenti capitulo, ut, sicut initium sermonis incipit a Sacra Scriptura, sic etiam et passim ad eam recurratur et omnis processus et prosecutio terminetur in illa. Si autem aliter fiet, hoc erit propter auctoritatum penuriam; quam non patietur praedicator, si thema bene acceperit, prudenter diviserit, et alia servaverit quae superius docui.[4]

---

[4] Thomas Waleys, pp. 386-389.

Medieval thematic sermon structure is impressive for its harmony. Authority as theme, protheme, or division topic is something which is analyzed and confirmed. (A theme's truth was not at issue; its spiritual impact was the preacher's concern.) Citations of authority which are subordinate to the theme, though they may themselves be subject to division, analysis, or confirmation and so serve as miniature themes, function as concordances. So complex a scheme was doomed to misinterpretation or only partial realization. It was difficult for all but the most learned and artful of preachers to have the rhetorical inventiveness and Scriptural knowledge necessary for the frequent production of good thematic sermons. The _ars praedicandi_ writers, recognizing this difficulty, often discussed an alternate sermon design which they termed "traditional." They valued it because, though less artful, it was based on the preaching styles of Christ and the Fathers. This simpler design was preferred for lay audiences. Its theme was often diffuse; it could encompass an entire Biblical epistle. Division was unnecessary and if used at all was of the most casual sort. This more elementary sermon design drew upon the devices discussed in the _ars praedicandi_ but did so in an unsystematic manner. While such a sermon style was always an option open to the medieval preacher, one suspects that it became more popular when scholastic sermon traditions began to break down in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The structure of the morality play can be related to the casual application of scholastic sermon rules but it does not correspond to the elaborate and harmonic schemes proposed by Robert Basevorn and his contemporaries.

XUM

Heretofore, this discussion has used the term authority to refer to Scripture quotations. The handbooks also regarded Patristic writings, the liturgy, and contemporary spiritual authorities as legitimate sources for prothemes or concordances; the artes insisted on Scripture only for sermon themes. Sermon practice, and eventually sermon theory, allowed the citation of classical authorities in divisions and concordances (there are also examples of classical prothemes). Only proverbs and popular songs were prohibited by the handbook writers. Practising preachers presumably resorted to such authorities to attract audiences unmoved by more academic sermon themes. Popular songs were always anathema to sermon theorists; but by the fifteenth century proverbs were increasingly tolerated as concordances when concealed deep within the sermon. We shall see that the playwrights share the preachers' preference for Scriptural and Patristic authority; but they also resort to proverb and song to capture audience interest and to enhance the dramatic designs of the plays.

It is important to keep in mind that the correspondence between techniques of the morality play and those of the thematic sermon is not systematic. The limits to the analogy serve as necessary parameters for a consideration of authority in the moralities. Most important, the plays of the morality genre do not begin with themes. Almost every late medieval sermon, whether of the university thematic variety or the marketplace lay variety, begins with a statement from Scripture which functions as the conceptual, and sometimes structural, center of the entire discourse. Similarly, the protheme does not have an analogue in the morality play; nor

XUM

are the plays divided. That is, the structure of the morality plays does not clearly conform to the thematic sermon design which relies on the detailed analysis of a series of selected Biblical quotations.

The morality play, being a form distinct from the thematic sermon, has unique priorities in its _inventio_, _dispositio_,and _elocutio_. The plays sometimes employ authority in a manner common to the medieval sermon, but the two uses are not identical. The moralities represent efforts to combine the doctrinal instruction characteristic of the sermon with the pleasing mimetic representation of a plot associated with drama. The playwrights attempt to create characters who function in some recognizable human manner but who at the same time represent the abstract concepts common to doctrinal discourse. In order to achieve a dynamic (or at least recognizably dramatic) representation of matter which is essentially conceptual and expository the playwrights resort to creating symbolic characters who perform allegorical actions. The challenge is to make the characters believable, their actions convincingly motivated, and the whole composition sufficiently absorbing or entertaining to hold the attention of an audience gathered in the busy atmosphere of the medieval stage. These priorities force two divergent areas of concern upon the morality playwright. One deals with creating a successful sermon or spiritual lesson; the second deals with making a good dramatic or literary object.

The simplest area of common ground between the sermonic and dramatic objectives of the morality play is the creation of characters who are instructive and dramatically credible. It is important to note in this context that the most uniform aspect of the morality plays (indeed, a

XUM

characteristic appropriately included in a definition of the genre) is their common focus on Mankind, Everyman, Humanum Genus, or Anima as a principal character and center of dramatic conflict. Around this figure is arrayed a cast bent upon helping either to save or damn Mankind. It is true that the moralities also have similar plots; however, the bulk of the plays is devoted not to the representation of action but to the planning, discussion, and interpretation of the plot. The plays are static, almost tableau-like representations; they are dominated by common casts of characters who, because of their shared discussion of how man may be saved, tend to exemplify their arguments with similar narratives. Characterization, then, is a central concern for the morality playwright in his effort to create a work which allows the priorities of sermon and drama to coexist.

The following consideration of the use of authority in morality drama will accordingly be divided into three parts: doctrinal uses, ethical or character-centered uses, and literary and dramatic uses of authority. It will be seen that while the use of authority in the moralities is frequent and often didactic, the playwrights have not merely inserted sermon passages into their plays. Rather, they have adapted the practices of the preacher. Sometimes the authors intend to teach a lesson (doctrinal use) and sometimes to create a character who has the attributes of a preacher (ethical use). Sometimes the citation of authority contributes directly to the achievement of an artistic, dramatic construct; elsewhere the writers simply use passages and phrases from the Vulgate to adorn the speech of a character (literary uses).

It cannot be stressed too much that the morality plays are not "*sermones corporei*."[5] They are didactic works drawing upon material and formal conventions of the sermon tradition; but as a body the plays do not correspond to the structural format of the sermons described in the *artes praedicandi*. Had the playwrights wanted to make "thematic plays" they surely could have. They deal with a common pastoral imperative which might be represented in the Scripture, "Whatsoever thou takest in hand, remember the end, and thou shalt never do amiss" (Ecclesiasticus vii.36). Most moralities have a prologue or banns which could easily have been designed to state, introduce, and even divide a theme. But the playwrights generally do not relate the events of the play and the lesson to be drawn from them to a single authority. Instead, a character, often unrelated to the *dramatis personae* of the play, comes on stage and sketchily reveals the plot in a speech designed also to settle the audience, attract its attention, gain its favor, and introduce the speaker. The closest example of a "thematic" introduction (which fulfills practices of the *ars praedicandi* protheme in its *captatio benevolentiae* function, as well) is the speech of the Messenger in *Everyman*. This twenty-one line statement actually offers a summarizing phrase which might be considered the play's theme:

> The story sayth: man, in the begynnynge
> Loke well, and take good heed to the endynge
> Be you neuer so gay . . . . (11. 10-12)[6]

---

[5] Edgar T. Schell, J.D. Shuchter, eds., *English Morality Plays and Moral Interludes* (New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, Inc., 1969), p. vii. The editors use this term to describe the plays.

[6] This and all subsequent quotations from the play are taken from W.W. Greg ed., *Everyman* (Louvain: Uystpruyst, 1904).

XUM

The moral is repeated, albeit diffusely, in the epilogue of the Doctor.[7] The Messenger in _Everyman_ is specific in his plot outline and assures the audience of a joyous end to the play with the lines: "This matter is wondrous precyous,/ But the intent of it is more gracyous,/ And swete to bear away" (ll. 7-9).

The other plays are much less helpful to their audiences. If they have an introduction which could function as a theme or protheme it is diffuse and integrated into the drama. _Wisdom's_ prologue is quite long (324 lines of a 1164-line play) and accomplishes the introductory outline of the theme by means of an instructional dialogue between Wisdom and the Soul. The dialogue form is a traditional one in medieval devotional literature; its distinction here is that the author actually intends it to be enacted. The revelation of the play's action occurs in Wisdom's last speech in the prologue (ll. 274-308) and takes the form of a detailed warning to _Anima_ of the dangers she will encounter. _Anima_ soon falls prey to all she is warned to avoid.[8] In a similar fashion the introduction to _Mankind_ extends well into the play. It ends at l. 309 when Mercy takes leave of Mankind after delivering a warning which, like Wisdom's speech, reveals much of the play's action. Mercy, however, has the derisive interruptions of the vices to cope with while instructing the audience in the bounty of his forgiveness and the traps which await man. Only *Castel of Perseverance* can be said to lack any prologue in which the play's moral and action are revealed. *Castel* opens with a boast from World. However, the play is accompanied by banns which give the moral and reveal the play's plot. The difficulty involved in calling the banns a thematic introduction arises in ll. 132-3: The First Flagbearer announces, ". . . we purpose us to playe/ Þis day seuenenyt before ȝou in syth . . . ."[9] If the banns preceded the performance by a week their effect on the audience's understanding of the play was probably minimal.

---

[7] This play also has a protheme passage. God's speech (ll. 22-64), while fulfilling the Messenger's prologue, also digresses into an account of the Crucifixion which is then related both symbolically and dramatically to God's present wrath. Just as _Everyman_ is alone in supplying an actual theme in its prologue, it is the only play with a protheme passage.

[8] Koontz, p. 35.

A critic, then, can find elements of thematic sermon structure operative in some moralities. But the essence of the thematic design, the repetition of a single Scriptural dictum (the theme), is not present in the plays. Instead the playwrights cite authority more informally. Their techniques are discussed in the handbooks under the heading "*dilatatio*," not "*thema*." The dramatists allowed authority to frame and embellish the arguments of their plays; but they did not let its words determine the overall form of their work. Such non-thematic use of authority in the sermon is discussed as early as Guibert of Nogent's treatise (ca. 1120):

> Solent etenim in tractatibus evangeliorum sententiae de Veteri Testamento adhibitae auditores reddere magis intentos, quia dum quidpiam eorum auditui novum insonat, animos quasi ex quadam voluptuosa sonoritate innovat. Hoc his contingere solet qui Scripturae secreta libenter inquirunt et semper discere quaerunt.[10]

---

[9] This and all quotations from the Macro plays are taken from Mark Eccles, ed., *The Macro Plays*, E.E.T.S., No. 262 (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1969). Sources and identifications of authority in the Macro plays are taken from Eccles' footnotes to this edition, unless otherwise noted.

[10] Guibert of Nogent, col. 25.

In the sermon such a piling up of favorable, respectable opinion, whether or not it served a confirming function in the preacher's argument (concordance), lent grace and weight to the presentation.

The most truly sermonic use of authority in the plays is called "doctrinal" in the present chapter. The adjective conveys the prestige which such quotations were meant to bring to their speakers. Yet it should prevent the reader from regarding the dramas' quotations as sermon themes. The term also stresses that these quotations of authority are not meant to contribute to the stage business of the moralities. Instead, the authorities are quoted for the instructive ends shared by the sermons and the plays.

There are several uses of authority in the morality plays which seem to be adapted for the *ars praedicandi* treatments of authority offered under "*dilatatio*." Characters in the dramas will sometimes pile up authorities to convince the audience of their learning and to make agreement on their point seem overwhelming. On occasion a playwright will cause one or more characters to cite (often different, usually Latin) authorities to repeat an important doctrinal point already made in the play's English dialogue. More often the characters will simply state an authority at the beginning of an argument or carry their point by means of an analysis of that opening authority. Still more frequently the argument is presented and the authority is offered at the end as a final confirmation of the argument's validity. All four moralities use authority in these doctrinal modes. The frequency of citations of this sort is probably the greatest justification for critics who call the plays embodied sermons or mere exercises in scholastic disputation. Yet the preacher-playwright and his audience were accustomed to the centuries-old tradition of making doctrinal points through the citation of authority. Scripture, the liturgy, and contemporary spiritual works were sources of wisdom and inspiration for all Christians. How better could a preacher convince his congregation? The plays attempted to answer this challenge by dramatizing the machinations of temptation and the terrible anxieties a fallen man suffered when he confronted his reckoning. The plays supplemented the persuasive techniques of the sermons with dramatic demonstration.

As already suggested, examples of the doctrinal use of authority are plentiful in the plays. Only a few samples will be supplied by way of demonstration. *Mankind* (ll. 32-36) offers a good example of an English translation of Scripture which serves as a theme for the remainder of the passage's argument:

> Se how Þe hede Þe members dayly do magnyfye. [Colossians 1.18;
> Who ys Þe hede forsoth I xall yow certyfye: I Corinthians xii.27]
> I mene Owr Sauyowr, Þat was lykynnyde to a lambe;
> Ande hys sayntys be Þe members Þat dayly he doth satysfye
> Wyth Þe precyose reuer Þat runnyth from hys wombe.

This passage is noteworthy for its unusual word-by-word explication of a theme. The plays do not ordinarily follow sermon practice so closely. An example of a less rigorously analyzed Latin quotation occurs in Truth's speech to God in *Castel of Perseverance*, ll. 3265a-3267.

> Aurum sitisti, aurum bibisti. ["not traced"]
>
> Þe more he hadde, Þe more he cravyd,
> Whyl Þe lyf lefte hym wythinne.

Everyman supplies an example of a proverb used as a concluding authority. In this speech Everyman is explaining to Goods why he has come seeking his

XUM

help. The proverb serves a doctrinal function; but the passage is an example of false reason, as Goods quickly points out:

EVERYMAN:
Therfore, I pray the go with me
For, parauenture, thou mayst before god almyghty
My rekenynge helpe to clene and puryfye
For it is sayd euer amonge
That money maketh all ryght that is wronge. [proverbial]

GOODS:
Nay, euery man, I synge an other songe
I folowe no man in suche vyages
For and I wente with the
Thou sholdes fare moche the worse for me (ll. 409-417)

A Scriptural use of authority as conclusion occurs in Wisdom, ll. 1073-1082. Anima is leaving sin and returning to an upright life:

In tweyn myghtys of my soule I the offendyde:
  The on by my inwarde wyttys, thow ben gostly;
Þe other by my outwarde wyttys comprehendyde,
  Tho be Þe fyve wyttys bodyly;
Wyth Þe wyche tweyn myghtys mercy I crye.
  My modyr, Holy Chyrche, hath yowe me grace,
Whom ye fyrst toke to yowr mercy,
  Yet of myselff I may not satysfye my trespas.

Magna est misericordia tua! [Psalms, lxxxv.13, cvii.5]
  Wyth full feyth of foryewenes to Þe, Lorde, I come.

A sustained example of Scriptural authority used repeatedly to stress a doctrinal point occurs in the battle scene of Castel of Perseverence. When the virtues rebut their adversary vices they select Scriptural passages which concern the sad end of sinful men more than the individual vices or virtues involved in the debate (ll. 2082-2364). The repetition of Scriptural passages on the same theme emphasizes the import of the struggle rather than the individual contests of each virtue. (The device serves a dramatic function as well. By being more concerned with man's

XUM

plight than with the personal attacks of the vices, the virtues can participate in a battle scene without doing damage to their conventionally peaceful demeanors.) When the Four Daughters gather in heaven to debate the fate of Man in Castel each sister resorts to piling up quotations to enhance her argument. The long argument of Mercy is a fine example (ll. 3313-3378): l. 3313a, II Corinthians i.3-4; l. 3339a, Gregory, P.L. lxxxix, col. 222; ll. 3351-2, John xix.28; ll. 3354-6 John xix.29-30; l. 3357, John xix.34; ll. 3361-4, Latin quotation, "not traced;" l. 3374, Psalm lxxxviii.29; l. 3378, Psalm lxxxviii.2. In sixty-five lines Mercy cites Patristic and Scriptural authority eight times.

All of the examples offered above demonstrate the brief impact any single "doctrinal" authority enjoyed in morality play speeches. The citations do not encompass the arguments in which they are used; they do not serve as themes. Instead, their most profound contribution to the plays' designs is to serve as tools for sustaining an argument, i.e., as devices for dispositio. More often, though, authority's contribution functions on the level of elocutio. That is, it merely repeats the speaker's argument in different phrases or in a different language. Such authority embellishes a point already made through dramatic demonstration or argument.

The ethical or character-centered uses of authority are of greater interest to a student of literature than the uses which relate primarily to the dianoia or doctrinal argument of the play. Every morality has at least one figure who operates as the force for good in the play. In Everyman Knowledge is this central force; Castel has the Good Angel; Mankind offers Mercy and Wisdom's good character is Wisdom. The function of these characters and their ancillary virtues as allegorized states of mind or body is to urge man to seek grace and abandon sin. Because of the static and declamatory nature of the plays every good character at some time in his play turns to Mankind or the audience and delivers a speech of moral counsel. This sermonizing is inevitably accompanied by citations of authority. In some plays the sermonizing pervades the character's realization. As a result, some critics have been prompted to take cues from costume notes and forms of reference and address in the plays and to speculate that the good character is actually portrayed as a preacher. Sister Philippa Coogan's reading of Mankind argues with good reason that Mercy is played in the garb of a cleric and that his role in the play is that of a priest.[11] Although Sr. Philippa does not pursue the idea, it is apparent that the priest's traditional function as a preacher is an important part of Mercy's character. Wisdom's good character identifies himself as Christ (ll. 1-16) and as counselor to man assumes the preacherly aspects of Christ as well as the redemptive role. Knowledge and the Good Angel also reveal an ethos common to the pulpit through their patterns of speech.

In Castel, Mankind, and Wisdom the presence of the preacher in the play is continuous. The action may move away from him to deal with man's dalliance with evil but the scene almost always returns to the preacher for a lament, admonition, or commentary on man's conduct. Everyman, a distinctive morality in many ways, does not begin with such a figure. Instead

---

[11] Sister Philippa Coogan, An Interpretation of the Moral Play, "Mankind" (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University Press, 1947), p. 6.

God sets the moral context of the play and then withdraws from the action. Everyman is portrayed as living in sin and the appearance later of a figure representing good counsel (Knowledge) signals an important reversal in the plot. Everyman, who has abandoned religion, must come to a reckoning with himself before he can heed the counsels of a preacher figure. Nonetheless, when Knowledge enters the drama he speaks like the other morality preachers.

It is difficult to separate clearly the use of authority for the creation of a preacherly character from its use to achieve doctrinal ends. The character who preaches is the main vehicle for doctrinal discourse in the plays. In the previous consideration of doctrinal authority the focus was placed upon uses which aimed at convincing the addressee of the gravity and validity of the character's argument. Such passages also serve to remind us that a character is preacherly. But there are other passages using authority which blend into the dramatic action of the morality plays. Although they are doctrinal, these uses also reinforce our understanding of the speaker's role as a force of good in the drama.

The Good Angel in _Castel_ is a character with such an _ethos_ and he shows a full range of preacherly sentiments. Most characteristically Good Angel lectures Man. He counters Man's decision to go with the World:

> A, nay, man, for Cristys blod,
> Cum agayn, be strete and style.
> Þe Werld is wyckyd and ful wod
> And þou schalt leuyn but a whyle.
> What coueytyst þou to wynne?
> Man, þynke on þyn endynge day
> Whanne þou schalt be closyd vndyr clay,
> And if þou thenke of þat aray,
> Certys þou schalt not synne.
>
> Homo, memento finis et in eternum non peccabis ["Varied from Ecclesiasticus vii.40"]
> (ll. 402-410a)

XUM

The speech, given here in its entirety, is a highly sermonic argument which is dramatically motivated; Good Angel is trying to convince Man not to heed World. It is Good Angel's style of speaking that assures us he is a preacherly figure. He speaks in strongly declarative sentences (e.g., "Þe Werld is wyckyd and ful wod," l. 404) and speaks with certainty, in imperatives, about man's destiny. The clearest indicator of the preacherly ethos is the citation from Ecclesiasticus which serves as the conclusion to the argument. The Good Angel also speaks to other characters in a preacherly voice. His main addressee other than man is the Bad Angel whose tempting, non-academic arguments are countered with traditional sermonic refutations. Good Angel answers Bad Angel:

A, pes aungel, Þou spekyst folye.
Why schuld he coueyt werldys goode,
Syn Criste in erthe and hys meynye
All in pouert here Þei stode?
Werldys wele, be strete and stye,
Faylyth and fadyth as fysch in flode,
But heueryche is good and trye,
Þer Criste syttyth bryth as blode,
Wythoutyn any dystresse.
To Þe World wolde he not flyt
But forsok it euery whytt.
Example I fynde in holy wryt,
He wyl bere me wytnesse.

Diuicias et paupertates ne dederis michi, Domine. [Proverbs xxx.8]
(ll. 349-361a)

Good Angel argues against Bad Angel's worldly counsels by citing the example of Christ's poverty and sacrifice and then confirming the point with Scripture. But the Good Angel does not always preach. When he is not in an adversary position he is given speeches which express anxiety over the bad turn of events in the play. Such lines do not use authority but they

XUM

are detached from the dramatic action in a manner which underscores the limit of the Good Angel's function in Castel. He is only a rhetorical force in the play; he lacks a tool to return Man to righteous living.[12] Good Angel laments:

So mekyl þe werse, weleawoo,
  Þat euere good aungyl was ordeynyd þe.
Þou art rewlyd aftyr þe fende þat is þi foo
  And noþynge certys aftry me.
Weleaway, wedyr may I goo?
  Man doth me bleykyn blody ble.
Hys swete sowle he wyl now slo.
  He schal wepe al hys game and gle
    At on dayes tyme.
  ȝe se wel all sothly in syth
  I am abowte boþe day and nyth
  To brynge hys sowle into blis bryth,
    And hymself wyl it brynge to pyne.   (ll. 1260-1272)

This speech follows one by Man and the opening lines refer to Man as "þe;" yet the dramatic context prevents Man from hearing the lines. Man is making his contract with Covetousness, probably on another part of the stage. So the Angel speaks a few lines of mournful soliloquy and then turns to the audience (l. 1269, "ȝe se . . . ") to express his impotence before man's free will. The ethos is still preacherly, the occasion of the passage is dramatic (i.e., justified by the sequence of events in the play, not only by rhetorical or doctrinal considerations) and the Good Angel is making a point about man's free will to sin. But the speech uses no authority; it is not sermonic. The Castel playwright is sensitive to the dramatic propriety of sermonic speech; when the dramatic context does not warrant the use of persuasive sermon style by a preacherly character the *exemplum*-filled, authority-quoting style of argument is abandoned.

---

[12] When Man does repent and take refuge in the Castel he is motivated to do so by the actions of Confession and Penitence. Their arrival is the result of Good Angel's lamenting. The activity of Bad Angel as commander-in-chief of the vices should be compared to Good Angel's relative passivity.

Mankind lacks *Castel*'s modulation of authority-quoting speech. Mercy is always a preacher; and his preoccupation with sermonizing is relentlessly mocked by Mischief and the vices. Their favored mode of derision seizes on the authority-quoting style of the good character and makes us all the more aware that Mercy (traditionally Man's main advocate in the heavenly parliament) is a tireless rhetorician. The comic byplay which assures our recognition of Mercy as a preacher begins early. Mercy quotes Scripture to confirm his argument. Mischief mimics the Scriptural language and calls Mercy's speech "predycacyon," or preaching:

> For sekyrly þer xall be a streyt examynacyon,
> The corn xall be sauyde, þe chaffe xall be brente.
> I besech yow hertyly, haue þis premedytacyon.
>
> MYSCHEFFE. I beseche yow hertyly leue yowr calcacyon.
> Leue yowr chaffe, leue yowr corn, leue yowr dalyacyon.
> Yowr wytt ys lytyll, yowr hede ys mekyll, ȝe are full of
> predycacyon. (ll. 42-47)

Everyman is less extravagant in its characterization of preacher figures. Nonetheless, Knowledge, though hardly an inveterate Bible-quoter, does resort to sermonizing at a most peculiar juncture in the play. While Everyman is confessing, Knowledge passes the stage time with a sermon on sinful priests. The topic does bear on the sacrament occurring off stage; but the topicality of the treatment does violence to the ritual and timeless context of the rest of the play. Knowledge is speaking like a synodal preacher; he condemns bad priests, overtly paraphrases Scripture and cites the omnipresent example of Christ.

Wisdom's preacher, as already remarked, draws on the traditional concept of Christ the preacher as man's spiritual counselor. The preacherly demeanor, though indisputably present in Wisdom, is subordinate to other, more divine aspects of Wisdom's character. The identification of Wisdom as a preacher is further blunted by the dialogue format of the play's opening 324 lines. Nonetheless, Wisdom's speech, like that of other authority-quoting characters in the play, freely supplements Scriptural and Patristic quotation with paraphrases and wholesale borrowings from the work of late medieval devotional writers, most notably Heinrich Suso and Walter Hilton. In addition, the play's conclusion, where Wisdom once again charges *Anima* to live virtuously, is not only filled with the citation of authority; it is divided into nine points which are discussed in a structurally parallel manner highly reminiscent of the medieval university sermon. One of the nine points is sufficient example of this sermonic style:

> The fyfte, Gode sethe: 'Haue pyte and compassyon
>   Off þi neybur wyche ys seke and nedy,
> And þat to me ys more dylectacyon
>   Than þou fastyde forty yer by and by,
>   Thre days in þe weke, as streytly
>   As þou cowdys in water and brede.'
>   Lo, pyte Gode plesyth grettly,
>   Ande yt ys a vertu soueren, as clerkys rede.

[Eccles offers no source for the quotation.]
(ll. 1029-1036)

It should be noted that Wisdom sheds some of his potency as a Christ figure in this passage. Each of the nine points is introduced by the term "Gode sethe" or "Chryst seth." The passage cited above also concludes with a deferential allusion to the teaching of "clerkys." In these lines Wisdom moves away from his powerful role as Christ where the use of the pronoun "I" carries great authority (see, for example, ll. 79-82). The decline

XUM

is not of long duration. Wisdom's last speech narrates the Passion in the first person (ll. 1095 ff.). The too preacherly speech of Wisdom discussed above actually weakens the dramatic continuity of the characterization.

Generally the playwright convinces us of the presence of preachers in the _dramatis personae_ early in the drama. Once the paradigm for preacherly _ethos_ is established the playwrights begin to use that pattern in innovative and highly dramatic ways in the speeches of other characters. The clearest use of authority to create _ethos_ for dramatic ends occurs in _Wisdom_. Lucifer enters the drama at l. 325. His bombastic speech is cast in short-lined stanzas with little of the aureation that characterized the speech of the previous 324 lines of the drama. He explains the causes of his enmity to man and reveals his plan for tempting and perverting Mind, Will, and Understanding. An integral part of this strategy is Lucifer's disguise. He describes it: "For, for to tempte man in my lyknes,/ Yt wolde brynge hym to grett feerfullness,/ I wyll change me into bryghtnes/ And so hym to-begyle . . . ." (ll. 373-7). Lucifer in brightness, it is quickly apparent, is a sophist or an evil preacher. Approaching the Three Mights, Lucifer uses a Latin Scriptural quotation in his aside to the audience. He then begins to tempt Mind by enforcing his arguments with Scriptural paraphrases:

> Mynde Mynde, ser, haue in mynde thys!
> MYNDE. He ys not ydyll þat wyth Gode ys.
> LUCYFER. No, ser! I prowe well yis.
>   Thys ys my suggestyun.
> All thynge hat dew tymes
> Prayer, fastynge, labour, all thes. [Ecclesiastes iii.1]
> Wan tyme ys not kept, þat dede ys amys
>   Þe more pleynerly to yowr informacyon.

Here ys a man Þat lywyt worldly,
Hath wyffe, chylderne, and serwantys besy,
And other chargys Þat I not specyfye.
Ys yt leeffull to Þis man
To lewe hys labour wsyde truly,
Hys chargys perysche Þat Gode gaff duly,
And yewe hym to preyer and es of body?
Woso do thus wyth God ys not than.

Mertha plesyde Gode grettly thore. [Luke x. 38-42]
(ll. 397-413)

Much of the play serves as an argument for the pursuit of the contemplative life. As the exchange just cited demonstrates, Lucifer's plan is to convince the Mights of the impossibility of a successful pursuit of a life of meditation and to force them to compromise their spiritual vocations. The Three Mights, as practitioners of the *vita contemplativa*, are portrayed as religious of unspecified level. Their vulnerability to Lucifer is of a learned and disputatious sort. They do not fall to covetousness or foolish fun the way the other mankind figures do.

Lucifer's assumption of sermonic speech patterns in *Wisdom* signals a change of temper and appearance. Other playwrights use sermonic speech, best realized through the citation of authority, to show changes of character in man, the center of the morality's dramatic conflict. Man is the most changeable figure in the plays and when he is in grace or living uprightly he often speaks like the preachers. *Mankind* shows a crude but keen awareness of the dramatic function of preacherly speech. When Mankind is in league with Mercy his speech shows the same fondness for aureation and the same tendency to cite authority as his mentor's. So, when he introduces himself Mankind delivers a description of his nature in the traditional, learned imagery of the conflict of body and soul. He further explains his spiritual composition by citing a proverb:

My name ys Mankynde. I haue my composycyon
  Of a body and of a soull, of condycyon contrarye.
Betwyx Þem tweyn ys a grett dyvisyon;
  He Þat xulde be subjecte, now he hath Þe victory.

Thys ys to me a lamentable story
  To se my flesch of my soull to haue gouernance.
Wher Þe goodewyff ys master, Þe goodeman may be sory. [Proverbial]
(ll. 194-200)

Later, when Mankind is successfully turning back the first attack of the vices, he delivers a sermonette. The speech is more a monologue than an address to the vices. Nonetheless, the use of authority, the learned allusion to the relation between body and soul and the aureate diction put Mankind in a preacherly mode at this point in the play:

Now blyssyde be Jhesu! my soull ys well sacyatt
  Wyth Þe mellyfluose doctryne of Þis worschyppfull man.
The rebellyn of my flesch now yt ys superatt,
  Thankynge be Gode of Þe commynge Þat I kam.

Her wyll I sytt and tytyall in Þis papyr
  The incomparable astat of my promycyon.
Worschypfull souerence, I haue wretyn here
  The gloryuse remembrance of my nobyll condycyon.

To haue remos and memory of mysylff Þus wretyn yt ys,
  To defende me from all superstycyus charmys:
'Memento, homo quod cinis es et in cinerem reuerteris.'
  Lo, I ber on my bryst Þe bagge of myn armys. [Job xxxiv. 15]
(ll. 311-322)

Mankind's speech in his fallen state is in stark contrast to his previous lofty demeanor. His first lines after succumbing to Titivillus have a different tempo and vastly less dignified diction and meaning:

Whope who! Mercy hath brokyn hys neke-kycher, avows,
Or he hanguth by Þe neke hye wppon Þe gallouse.
Adew, fayer masters! I wyll hast me to Þe ale-house
  Ande speke wyth New Gyse, Nowadays and Nought
And geett me a lemman wyth a smattrynge face. (ll. 607-611)

XUM

When Mankind rectifies his ways the preacherly speech (but not the quotation of authority) resumes immediately:

> Alasse, I haue be so bestyally dysposyde, I dare not apere.
> To se yowr solaycyose face I am not worthy to dysyere. (ll. 813-814)

The modulation of voice in Everyman is far more subtle than that of other morality plays. Again, the hero, Everyman, is the play's changeable figure and his character development is in part represented by shifts in the use of authority. The play begins with its protagonist in a fallen and perilous state. The initial action of the play is designed to show us the extent of Everyman's depravity. First, he tries to bribe Death to forestall his reckoning day. Then Everyman faces his task and drafts a plan of action. To explain Everyman's low state the playwright entertains and moves us with a dramatization of the hero's interviews with Fellowship, Kindred and Cousin, and Goods; but he also gives us Everyman's thoughts and reactions before and after each of these episodes. We are forced to examine the workings of Everyman's mind throughout these scenes. (This is a sound design. In being involved in Everyman's mental processes we are so much better able to share the mounting anxiety and panic Everyman experiences as he runs out of resources for his reckoning.) We find that the hero's thinking is authority-laden and very much like that of his Scripture-quoting, morality play counterparts. But there is one difference. The unregenerate Everyman relies on proverbs and clichés to guide his thinking. His false friends likewise base their discourse on non-Scriptural authority. For example, Everyman extracts a bantering promise of friendship and commitment from Fellowship. Before broaching his request he quotes a proverb, "Than be you a good frende at nede" (l. 229). After Everyman asks Fellowship to go to his reckoning, the friend begins, " . . . promyse is duty" and proceeds to break his promise. Finally, pleased to have removed himself from his predicament, Fellowship insincerely concludes," . . . fare well now at the ende/ . . . p[ar]tyng is mournynge " (ll. 301-2). Schell and Shuchter note that "the writer gets a nice irony by giving a rather pompous sententia to Fellowship at l. 302 (p. 122, n. 8). Everyman then evaluates his situation and through an analysis based on the citation of proverbs settles on Kindred as his next resource:

> It is sayd in prosperyte men frendes may fynde
> Whiche in aduersyte be full vnkynde [Proverbial]
> Now wheder for socoure shall I flee
> Syth that felawshyp hath forsaken me
> To my kynnesmen I wyll truely
> Prayenge them to helpe me in my necessyte
> I byleue that they wyll do so
> For kynd wyll crepe where it may not go
> I wyll go saye for yonder I se them go [Proverbial]
> Where be ye now my frendes and kynnesmen
> (ll. 309-318)

The proverb-based reasoning continues into the Goods episode where this false friend openly disputes the turth of Everyman's most recent dictum (l. 414). From the time that Death leaves the stage until Everyman meets Knowledge, the only source of authority in the highly aphoistic speeches of the play is proverbial. When Knowledge introduces Confession and commands Everyman to kneel and "aske mercy" (l. 543) Everyman blurts, "O gloryous fou[n]tayne $\overset{t}{y}$ all uncle[n]nes doth claryfy/ Wasshe fro me the

XUM

spottes of vyce unclene,/ That on me no synne may be sene." (ll. 545-7). The text is a paraphrase of Zechariah xiii.1. After this dramatic peripety the main source of authority for the speeches of all the characters (but most notably Everyman and Knowledge) is Scripture, liturgy, and contemporary spiritual works. This play does not indulge in frequent quotation of the Vulgate. Scripture is Englished and subordinated to the flow of poetry or thought in the play's speeches. Nonetheless, after l. 545 the only proverbial attribution (according to Cawley's and Schell's research) is Beauty's departure line: "I take my tappe in my lappe and am gone" (l.801). This suddenly frivolous line stands out from its context of decorous speech and underscores the ephemeral nature of Beauty as a human asset. We also note that she is the first speaker in a new pattern of desertion. The momentary return to proverbial expression stresses the analogy between this scene and the desertions of the false friends on whom Everyman had relied earlier. Authority is a quiet but potent instrument of dramatic characterization for the Everyman playwright.

It remains to consider the purely poetic or literary uses of authority in the moralities. These fall into two categories: those instances where the writer is using authority (generally Latin) to embellish the speech of a character and those ("dramatic" uses) where authority is cited to fulfill a structural function in the play's design. Michael Kelley has speculated that the frequent quotation of the Vulgate in Castel of Perseverance is intended to ornament the speech of the virtues who use it.[13] It should be

---

[13] Michael R. Kelley, "Fifteenth Century Flamboyant Style and the Castel of Perseverance," Comparative Drama, 6 (1972), 24.

XUM

evident from the foregoing discussion that the present writer does not agree that the sole or major function of authority is decorative. Nonetheless, there are instances in the moralities where authority, especially the *Vulgate*, is used to increase the affectivity of a speech, to evoke ideas which will enrich the texture of a speech, or to convey a dramatic notion through the mere strangeness of macaronic verse. Mercy's speech before God at the finale to *Castel* is a beautiful example of authority used for pathetic, if not aesthetic, ends. Mercy is narrating the Crucifixion and she repeatedly lapses into Latin borrowed primarily from the narrative of the Passion in the Gospel of St. John. Her intent is to move God to mercy; and the repetition of the Passion story is lifted from the tedious (every virtue at one time or another in this play has described the relevance of Christ's Passion to her particular quality) to the affective by incorporating key phrases from a highly familiar and moving Scriptural narrative of the event:

Si pro peccato vetus Adam non cecidisset, [Gregory, *P*. *L*.
Mater pro nato numquam grauidata fuisset. lxxix, col. 222]

Ne had Adam synnyd here-before
  And Þi hestys in paradys had offent,
Neuere of Þi modyr Þou schuldyst a be bore,
  Fro heuene to erthe to haue be sent.
But thyrti wyntyr here and more,
  Bowndyn and betyn and al to-schent,
Scornyd and scovrgyd sadde and sore,
  And on Þe rode rewly rent,
  Passus sub Pilato Poncio. [Nicene Creed,
As Þou henge on Þe croys though Eccles
  On hye Þou madyste a voys, and Schell
Mans helthe, Þe gospel says, supply no source]
  Whanne Þou seydyst 'Scitio'. [John xix.28]
scilicet, salutem animarum.

Þane Þe Jeves Þat were vnquert
  Dressyd Þe drynke, eysyl and galle.
It to taste Þou myth nowth styrt

XUM

But seyd 'Consummatum est' was alle.
A knyt wyth a spere so smert, [John xix.29-30]
Whanne Þou forgafe Þi fomen-Þrall,
He stonge Þe, Lord, vnto Þe hert.
Þanne watyr and blod gan ovte wall,
Aqua baptismatis et sanguis redempcionis. [no source]
Þe watyr of baptomm,
Þe blod of redempcioun
Þat fro Þin herte ran down
Est causa saluacionis. [Eccles: "not traced"]
(ll. 3339a-3365)

Unfortunately, the astuteness which crafted Mercy's speech in Castel is not common to all morality playwrights. There are examples where the playwright clearly believed that Latin citation would enhance the beauty of his character's speech; to a modern reader the author's judgment seems weak and the speech sounds stilted. Two such instances occur in a single speech by Mercy in Mankind. Speaking of Mankind in a monologue Mercy declares:

In trust ys treson; Þi promes ys not credyble; [Proverbial]
Thy peruersyose ingratytude I can not rehers.
To God and to all Þe holy corte of hewyn Þou art despectyble,
As a nobyll versyfyer makyth mencyon in Þis verse:
'Lex et natura, Cristus et omnia jura
Damnant ingratum, lugent eum fore natum.' [author unknown]
(ll. 750-755)

Lines 754-5 are particularly cumbersome. Eccles does not offer the source of this quotation and the jingle of the meter and rhyme of the leonine verse do not enhance the dignified but distressed tone for which Mercy's speech is striving. A similar misjudgment in poetic use of authority is Mercy's conclusion to his lament, "Xall I not fynde hym? Yes, I hope. Now Gode by my proteccyon!/ My predylecte son, where be ye? Mankynde, vbi es?" (ll. 770-771). The Latin tag, "ubi es," is made somewhat ridiculous by Mischief's and the vices' immediate mockery of the query. Such speeches

XUM

are difficult primarily for twentieth-century readers. The medieval writer worked in a tradition where the citation of authority and the use of Latin were signs of learnedness and sensitivity. In these passages the value of authority in medieval writing dominates artistic considerations.

More satisfactory literary use of authority is made on a structural or dramatic level in the morality plays. Castel uses Latin authority with success when the playwright is striving to repeat parallel structures. As other critics have observed, Castel is written in nine- and thirteen-line stanzas. The stanzas generally fall into a statement and conclusion pattern with recognizable grammatical breaks at lines four and nine.[14] The Castel playwright has sometimes used authority to punctuate these structural patterns. The clearest example of structural parallelism and repetition in Castel is the battle episode. Each of the virtues must reply to the attacks of her opposite. A pattern is established wherein the vice insults the virtue and she retorts by drawing an exemplification of the rewards of her particular virtue from the life of Christ. The speeches of the virtues are sermonettes and most rely on citation of the Vulgate for their ethical authority. Humility begins. She cites Luke twice as a concluding line to each stanza.[15] The next virtue, Patience, quotes James at line 4a of her first stanza. (Every virtue speaks two stanzas, twenty-six lines, of reply.) Charity follows Patience's pattern. At l. 2186 Belial grows impatient with the deliberate progress of the battle vaunts and joins in combat. The vices are repulsed; they regroup and resume the verbal challenges. Abstinence and Chastity cite authority and rebut their opponents in the pattern set up by Patience. The last of the six victorious virtues returns to the initial pattern established by Humility. The defeated virtue, Largess, also speaks in this format; but her two stanzas express her inability to overcome Covetousness. The other six women had discussed how Christ practised their virtue. The pattern of the virtues' speeches in battle may be sketched, ABBBBAA$_1$, where "A$_1$" represents a repetition of structure "A" with significantly varied content. The systematic use of authority marks each movement in this repetitive design and makes the pattern more obvious. The playwright resumes the patterning in the virtues' speeches after Man leaves the Castel of Perseverance. All seven virtues, in uninterrupted sequence, examine their inability to keep man in the Castel against his will. Each virtue speaks one full stanza. The last four virtues, who can only echo the arguments of the first three, quote the Vulgate at line five of their speeches. The recurrence of authority in the same place in each speech underscores the repeated content of the virtues' lines.

---

[14] Jacob Bennett, "The 'Castel of Perseverance': Redactions, Place, and Date," Medieval Studies, 24 (1962), 142.

[15] Eccles does not choose to include many of these Latin quotes in his line numbering; they receive the number of the English line they follow with the addition of the subscript "a." In this instance the lines are the fourteenth in each of the stanzas they conclude. They do not seem extraneous to the flow of the play's verse, but Eccles apparently wants to preserve the play's thirteen-line stanza format.

It is Everyman which makes the most appealing structural use of authority. The portrayal of Everyman's state of mind through the sorts of authorities he prefers has already been discussed. In addition to its ethical overtones this feature also stresses a turning point in the structure of the play. This peripety in *Everyman* where the hero appeals to Knowledge and Penance for aid is not the only example of such structurally controlled use of Scripture. *Everyman*, to a greater extent than the Macro moralities, is a sacramental play. Set in the liturgical time of Lent, the eschatological time of the Last Judgment, and the human time of man's last days, the play stresses the significance of Confession, Communion, and Extreme Unction. (Allowing the play such a focus makes Knowledge's digression on sinning priests who administer the sacraments a bit more acceptable.) While the Macro playwrights may use Scripture simply to lend dignity or power to a character's speech, the author of *Everyman* uses authority more sparingly. Scriptural quotation is reserved for sacramental events in the play. The dramatist is giving up rhetorically motivated citation of authority for a more dramatically justified use.

The performance begins with Messenger quoting a proverbial version of Ecclesiasticus vii. 36 (ll. 10-11). He is giving us the *sententia* or theme of the play. Everyman blurts out a free paraphrase of Matthew xxiv.50, 51 at line 119. These are his first words when he realizes that Death has come for him. The next Scriptural statement (a close translation this time) marks the moment of Everyman's discovery. Quoting Zecahriah, he turns to Knowledge and Confession for guidance (l. 545). Scripture (I Peter v.1) is again paraphrased at ll. 601-4. Here Everyman's prayer is a dramatic recreation of the confession which propriety prevented the playwright from dramatizing. Only in the passage where Everyman reaches the sacramental climax of the play, when he goes to Priesthood to receive Extreme Unction and his final Communion, does the author cite Scripture copiously. From line 706 to line 887 (where Everyman descends into the

XUM

grave) Scripture and liturgy are paraphrased or alluded to six times.[16] The final Scriptural reference in this passage (ll. 886-7) is the first Latin quotation of the play. Everyman's last words are Christ's last words in St. Luke's narrative of the Passion "In manus tuas . . . commendo spiritum meum."

The patterning of authority in *Everyman*, both proverbial and Scriptural, demonstrates how far afield from the argumentative practice of sermons the morality preacher-playwright could take the tools of the pulpit. Authority in *Everyman* is not a dominant structural element; but it does function as a formal *leit-motif* in the play. The use of authority is subsumed by the playwright's larger doctrinal and dramatic concerns. In *Everyman* the citation of authority has developed from a sermonic device into a dramatic one.

Since the intent of the morality plays is pastoral it is not surprising that paraphrases and quotations of Scripture, liturgy, and contemporary spiritual authority fill the dramas. For centuries preachers had counseled congregations with this vocabulary. What is noteworthy is the restraint which the authors used in adapting authority to the demands they felt as playwrights. The plays make doctrinal and moral points. They deal freely with the matter of the medieval sermon. But formally they cannot be regarded as dramatized sermons. The plays have an identity of their own and the independence of this identity is well illustrated in the selective way in which they use authority.

---

[16] According to A.C. Cawley's research, Scripture and liturgy are paraphrased, alluded to, or quoted eleven times in the 921 line play. [*Everyman* (Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1961), notes to text] Only four citations occur in the 705 lines prior to the play's sacramental climax. The final scene is but 181 lines long and uses Scriptural and liturgical authority six times. The dialogue after Everyman's departure and the epilogue (ll. 889-921) cites Scripture once.

The _artes praedicandi_ give authority two distinct functions in the thematic sermon. A Scriptural authority serves as the theme of the sermon. It dominates the structure of the entire work. Its topic controls the subject matter of the speech while its grammar and diction suggest the analytical devices (_dilatationes_) which constitute the body of the sermon. The morality plays have no corresponding part, the plays are not "thematic" in design. Instead, the moralities adopt the sermon's second application of authority. In the processes of division, subdivision, and dilation the preacher cited authorities which enriched and expanded the meaning of the theme. These authorities lent the weight of traditional wisdom to the preacher's points and they portrayed the speaker as a worthy and learned man. This use of authority as an auxiliary, a device which enhanced an already presented episode or argument, is shared by the medieval sermon and the morality play.

It must be acknowledged, however, that the citation of authority is a common practice in Middle English literature. By the fifteenth century the network of authorities which Thomas Waleys's preaching treatise describes (pp. 386-389) was so common in learned and serious expression that secular literature often acknowledged the style. For example, some of Chaucer's pilgrims speak of authority when they caution that their styles are not of the learned variety. The Wife of Bath opens her prologue stressing that she is experienced, not learned, "Experience, though noon auctoritee/ Were in this world, is right ynogh for me . . . ."[17]

---

[17] _Canterbury Tales_, "The Wife of Bath's Prologue," ed. F.N. Robinson, _The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer_, 2nd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1957), ll. 1-2.

Similarly, the Parson advises his fellow pilgrims, " . . . this meditacioun/ I putte it ay under correccioun/ of clerkes, for I am nat textueel;/ I take but the sentence . . . ."[18] (While the Parson demurs that he is not "textual," his tale, like the Wife's, is rife with Scriptural and learned quotation and allusion.)

Most Middle English religious prose cited authority copiously. N.F. Blake, in a newly issued anthology, Middle English Religious Prose, devotes several introductory pages to the citation of authority in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century works. His observations document my own on the use of authority in the morality plays:

> Although the Bible is the basic text of Christianity, it rarely provides the principal material or theme of Middle English religious literature. It appears most frequently as an authority for a moral judgment or as a yardstick by which to judge human behaviour. Thus it may provide the characters who appear, such as St. Paul in the Lambeth Sermon on Sunday . . ., but it does not supply the actions they undertake; these are usually of a more recent date. Similarly, biblical texts may be used to support the argument of a passage . . ., even though the biblical texts have only a general relationship with the theme under discussion . . . . So although the Bible has rarely provided the immediate material of these texts, it is always present in the background.[19]

The writer goes on to discuss the use of liturgical excerpts and the quotation of proverbs in devotional prose. Blake's anthology includes sermons, and the conclusion to be drawn, albeit tentatively, is that the late Middle English sermon is discarding thematic design for greater stress on the

---

[18] Canterbury Tales, "The Parson's Prologue," ll. 55-58.

[19] (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern Univ. Press, 1972), pp. 14-15.

XUM

secondary or auxiliary employment of authority. The later *artes praedicandi* give recognition to the preacher who follows the practice of the thematic sermon only loosely. Nonetheless, the popularity of this secondary use implies that the morality dramatists borrowed their practices from current sources of pulpit technique, contemporary sermons.

Although such a suggestion draws critical attention away from the instruction of the *artes praedicandi*, it must be remembered that rhetorical handbooks were repositories of traditional theory which were at best propaedeutic to contemporary practice. It should never be argued that the *artes* were the sole or primary source for the morality playwrights' knowledge of sermon practice. Instead, they supply modern literary historians and critics with compact and theoretical treatments of the lively art of sermon writing. Modern readers can find therein discussions of ways in which authority can be used. One of these ways comes to pervade the later Middle English devotional writing of which the morality plays are an important subdivision.

Just as the sermon's use of authority was changing in the late Middle Ages, so was the employment of authority in the morality plays fair ground for innovation. The foregoing discussion has attempted to delineate three distinct uses of authority in the plays. Each of the three, doctrinal, ethical, and dramatic and literary, is less closely related to sermon practice than the previous one. There is much similarity between the non-thematic use of authority in the medieval sermon and the doctrinal use of authority in the plays. Ethical uses rely less on the *ars praedicandi*'s discussion of sermon design than on the discussions of the proper conduct and speech of a preacher. Authority is employed in these instances to make a dramatic character more believable or more naturally didactic. If a player reminds his audience of a preacher he can use that resemblance as an edge in his efforts to instruct. Dramatic uses of authority are less readily related to medieval sermon theory. When an author uses authority-quoting speech as a signal for character development he has removed a rhetorical practice from the domain in which it was created. The use of rhetorical devices for literary or dramatic ends is a natural and happy process in playwriting. Insofar as the morality playwrights have adapted the practices of the pulpit to dramatic uses the charge that they merely dramatized or embodied sermons has been transcended. The range of sermon relatedness in these three uses of authority confirms that while the preacher-playwrights were partaking of the general authority-quoting habit of medieval devotional literature, they were also going to the source of that habit, sermon theory and practice, for doctrinal and ethical uses of authority.

Chapter IV: The Use of "Contraries" in the Morality Plays

The term "contraries" awkward as it is in English, has been taken from the _dilatatio_ sections of the _artes praedicandi_ to refer to a set of literary devices which were widely used in medieval devotional literature. The term is retained in this discussion because its very unfamiliarity allows it to encompass notions which could not be included in a more familiar critical term. Contraries can refer to the simple yoking of antithetical ideas, or to the grand contrasting of forces of good and evil in a _psychomachia_. We have seen that the term has a variety of manifestations in the _artes praedicandi_. Its versatility is also evident in its several uses in the English morality plays. Indeed, the technique of contraries is used so frequently and occurs on such different levels of literary making (_inventio_, _dispositio_, and _elocutio_) that thinking and expression in opposites or contraries seems to be a basic principle in the conception and composition of fifteenth-century sermon and dramatic literature.

There are three main ways in which sermon handbooks discuss principles of opposition. First, the _materia_ of the sermons often depicted ideas or characters opposing one another. The sermon which inveighed against vice, praised virtue, and looked to everlasting reward or punishment was certainly one of the first Christian sermons ever preached. Alain of Lille used contraries to arrange the sermon cycle he appended to his _Summa de Arte Praedicatoria_. Alain first offers sermons against vices; then he offers a series encouraging different virtues. Most sermons treated both a vice and its corresponding virtue. The two attributes were often personified and frequently portrayed in a struggle.

Other popular antagonisms depicted in medieval preaching were the contrast between the body and soul and between the pains of hell and the rewards of heaven.[1]

Later preachers, like Pseudo-Aquinas, proposed a second use for contraries. They urged that an opposite meaning be discussed in a sermon as a form of correction. This application of contraries to sermon *dispositio* was especially important when the sermon topic was vice. The sermon theorists did not think that the discussion of evil alone would move a listener to virtue. Instead, the preacher was encouraged to speak at least briefly about the corresponding virtue.[2] The handbooks also often urged preachers to analyze the opposite, or converse meaning of their themes. Christian Borgsleben especially recommends a consideration of the "*sensum oppositum thematis*"for popular sermons.[3]

Third, contraries figured in the *artes praedicandi* as a favorite means of dilation. A theme or authority could be effectively expanded by considering the antonyms of the main terms of the quotation. "Confirming" authorities could be adduced on the strength of their opposite meaning to the theme.[4] Further variations in *dilatatio* could be worked by taking the contrary of any term or idea which the preacher wished to extract from his theme. For example, a preacher could take the term "foot" from his authority, establish that its opposite was "hand" and proceed to discuss the Isidorean etymologies of "hand."[5] These techniques were also used to introduce sermon themes. Distinction, a kind of sermon dilation, relied heavily on contraries as well. A preacher wishing to expand a theme might take one word from the quotation and note its several different references. The references, always conveying some moral point, often relied upon a sense of opposition to one another for their effectiveness.[6]

---

[1] Gerald R. Owst, *Literature and the Pulpit in Medieval England*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1961), Chapter VII, "Sermon and Drama."

[2] Pseudo-Aquinas, p. 82.

[3] Christian Borgsleben, p. 71.

[4] Thomas Waleys, p. 398.

The notion of contraries is also a rich and fundamental element in the traditional source materials of medieval devotional and pulpit literature. A vision of the cosmos as an array of antagonistic, antithetical forces was basic to the Christian tradition. Opposing forces of good and evil, both terrestrial and angelic, fill the narratives of the Old and New Testaments. In addition to inheriting material conventions which were drawn up into venerable oppositions, the medieval preachers and playwrights were also heirs to a philosophical tradition which structured elements of the universe in elaborate hierarchies of repeating design. Often members occupied highest and lowest rungs in the cosmological ladders because of antithetical elements in their natures. Just as often two members would be arranged one below the other for the same reason. The parent scheme for the elaborate medieval cosmologies is attributed to the Neo-Platonists Plotinus and Proclus. The history of much of later medieval philosophy

---

[5] Thomas Waleys, pp. 398-403; Robert of Basevorn, pp. 180-182.

[6] There is a good example of this technique quoted on page 75 of this dissertation. Also, see discussions of "distinctio" and "pluralitatis acceptio."

XUM

can be described as efforts to reconcile these cosmologies with different perceptions of reality.[7]

The combined effect of these material and philosophical traditions on the medieval preacher-playwright was profound. He often viewed man's efforts to achieve salvation in terms of battles between antithetical forces. He created elaborate hierarchies of evil and good forces and he crafted ingenious patterns of repetition which he occasionally inverted.

Morality play invention is most often discussed as being formulated on principles of opposition found in medieval sermons. Since the morality plays all portray a perennial sermon topic, the vulnerability of man to vice and the need for virtuous living, it is inevitable that they should copiously borrow the _materia_ and imagery of pulpit tradition. Gerald R. Owst has offered considerable documentation for the substantive interrelationship of sermon and morality play. Many of his arguments rely on the descriptions and conventional antagonisms of allegorized vices and virtues.[8] He devotes much attention to the similar ways in which medieval sermons and plays draw upon the _psychomachia_.

Shared literary materials often incur shared formal characteristics, as well. Critics of the plays have observed that the array of opposing forces in the morality plots is also manifested in the structure of the dramas. Tucker Brooke, for example, has observed that "the history of the

---

[7] For a good general discussion of this view and a specific treatment of the Neo-Platonists see David Knowles, _The Evolution of Medieval Thought_ (New York: Vintage Books, 1962), especially pages 16-31.

[8] Owst, _Lit._, Chapter VII.

XUM

morality is really the history of the conflict plot. It was this which offered the greatest amount of human interest [and] the greatest opportunity for differentiation of character . . . ."[9] Bernard Spivack narrows Brooke's definition of conflict in the moralities to a "conflict of spiritual opposites."[10] Morris Roberts would call the conflict of vices and virtues an identifying characteristic of the morality play.[11]

Some critics seek to link the Psychomachia of Prudentius and its tradition to the morality plays. J.B. Wharey has studied the tradition of the psychomachia in medieval literature and concluded that the original Psychomachia was simply a war between the vices and virtues. Man, for example, in the morality plays, later became the victors' prize. The combat finally evolved into the temptation of man, with the vices and virtues as agents.[12] Werner Habicht believes that the psychomachia tradition functions in the moralities as a characterizing device. It is through the panoply of contrasting players, each with an introductory monologue, that we learn of the characteristic behavior of mankind. Habicht is suggesting that the moralities present the interior reality of man, his "inner dualism," which is a competition between vice and virtue, good angels and bad angels, body and soul, etc.

---

[9] C.F. Tucker Brooke, Tudor Drama (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, The Riverside Press, 1911), p. 61.

[10] Spivack, p. 72.

[11] Morris Roberts, "A Note on the Sources of the English Morality Play," University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 18 (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1923), p. 101.

[12] J.B. Wharey "Bunyan's Holy War and the Conflict-type of Morality Play," Modern Language Notes, 34 (1919), 66. Morton Bloomfield has studied the portrayal of vice in medieval literature in The Seven Deadly Sins (E. Lansing: Mich. State College Press, 1952). See p. 62, especially, for a treatment of the "general sense of opposition and contrast" fostered by the psychomachia motif.

By virtue of its enactment of the psychomachia the morality play, according to Habicht, becomes a dramatic compendium of the conflict and debate traditions of medieval literature.[13] Roberts agrees that the morality is a result of the semi-dramatic débat traditions (of which Chaucer's "Parliament of Fowls" is a late and urbane example) applied to psychomachia poems.[14] The principle of opposition shared by the débat and psychomachia traditions and the morality play formulates the antagonism of two forces locked in argument or conflict in notable ways.

The plays' themes then, foster distinctive sorts of inventio and dispositio. For example, many critics are fascinated by the comedy in the morality plays. Spivack notes the "contrapuntal tone" of the moralities. He sees the incorrigible humor of the vice as a foil to the tragic state of mankind.[15] David Bevington argues that this juxtaposition of comic and serious elements demonstrates the comprehensiveness of medieval viewpoints. The plays show no notion of the limitations of artistic decorum; rather, they evidence "the integration of obverse and alternating textures into a single and yet multiform art."[16] On a less grand scale, Ernst Curtius has observed that the Middle Ages developed an antithetical style which reveled in cerebral paradoxes like "puer senex." The style was a result of an approach which viewed man and nature in abstract terms.[17] Helmut Hatzfeld focuses Curtius' generalization on the epochal style of the fifteenth century. He calls the style "flamboyant," describes it as "le style des contrastes, même des 'contrevérités'" and stresses that flamboyance is a characteristic of both the material and verbal aspects of late medieval literature.[18]

---

[13] Werner Habicht, Studien zur Dramenform vor Shakespeare: Moralität, Interlude, romaneskes Drama (Heidelberg: Winter, 1968), p. 29.

[14] Roberts, p. 117.

[15] Spivack, p. 194.

[16] David Bevington, From "Mankind" to Marlowe: Growth of Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962), p. 4.

On various levels, each of these critics is discussing a fundamental aspect of fifteenth-century English literature: its fondness for opposition, contrast, and paradox. We have seen that contraries dominated invention in Christian literature from its beginnings. It must also be noted that the literary taste of fifteenth-century Europe intensified this interest in contraries. The love of literary ornamentation and elaborate construction drove the already strong inclination of the Christian writer to some surprising extremes.[19] When his traditional heritage and his contemporary audience were so preoccupied with elaborate patterns of repetition and opposition in matter, form, and expression it is hardly surprising that a medieval preacher or playwright seemed to return to principles of opposition so frequently in his writing.

---

[17] Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York: Harper and Row, 1953, Rpt. 1963), p. 150.

[18] Helmut Hatzfeld, "La Littérature Flamboyante au XV^{e} Siécle," *Studi in onore di Carlo Pellegrini II* (Rome: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1963), p. 96.

[19] For evidence of this late medieval fondness for ornament and complexity the reader is referred to the discussions of the *artes praedicandi* of Thomas Waleys and Robert of Basevorn (sup., pp. 37-38). Arguments and demonstrations of the literary realization of this tendency, termed flamboyance, may be found in the works of Helmut Hatzfeld and Walter Schirmer. Helmut Hatzfeld, "La Littérature Flamboyante . . .;" Walter Schirmer, "The Importance of the Fifteenth Century for the Study of the English Renaissance with Special Reference to Lydgate," in *English Studies Today*, ed. Charles Wrenn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951), pp. 104-110; Johan Huizinga, *The Waning of the Middle Ages* (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1954, Rpt. 1949 edition, first published 1924); Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1953).

When studying the relationship between the morality plays and preaching theory this widespread interest in plots, subjects, and literary forms expressing contraries must be kept in mind. Fifteenth-century sermon and dramatic practice partake of the general literary trends of their era. Nevertheless, there are some uses of contraries in the plays which are clear adaptations of sermon theory. There are other traditional uses which are absorbed into the *ars praedicandi* tradition and can be argued to appear in the plays as the result of the mediation of the handbooks. However, it must be kept in mind that many uses of contraries are reflections of such a widespread medieval practice that the determination of a source is impractical. In consequence, the following discussion will attempt to point out analogous uses of opposites in sermon theory and morality plays, with indication of the larger context that this principle enjoyed.

There are two main sermon-related applications of contraries in morality play invention. The *psychomachia* and the antagonism of body and soul are primary *topoi* of devotional literature employed in the moralities on a large scale. These uses of contraries are the most difficult ones to ascribe to the influence of the *artes praedicandi*. The sample sermons accompanying the handbooks are rife with examples of the body-soul and *psychomachia* conflicts. The combat and contrast of virtues and vices are essential to sermon invention; but the handbooks do not designate these aspects of *inventio* as especially suited for preaching. Rather, they seem to be part of the ambience of medieval devotional literature. These devices, then, are only shared by sermon and play.

The most fully discussed application of contraries in morality play invention is the *psychomachia* motif. This allegorical trope, based on Prudentius' fifth-century Latin narrative poem of the same name, portrays seven vices in battle against seven virtues. The actions and costumes of the characters are related in great detail but the bulk of the poem consists of long declamatory speeches by each figure. The speeches, many of which classify as vaunts (out of the classical traditions for epic battles), are disquisitions on the pleasure or beauty of the speaker's special attribute. There is little room for dynamic action in the story; the poem is better described as a sequence of verbal tableaux depicting the eventual triumph of virtue. Prudentius' poem fostered many medieval treatises describing vices and virtues. Both the fifth-century epic and its successors were important source books for the medieval sermon and medieval iconography. It is often noted that the battle scenes in *Castel of Perseverance* are simply a theatrical representation of Prudentius' epic. The vices and virtues in the play are each portrayed and they participate in a battle most remarkable for its static vaunts and highly simplified symbolic combat (most notably, the vices are repulsed with roses).

Other moralities show vestiges of the *pyschomachia*, but *Castel* is the only play which attempts to recreate the main idea of the epic. J.B. Wharey's history of the *psychomachia* argues that the tradition became increasingly concerned with man as the symbolic battleground or prize for the winner of the struggle.[20] Such a development meshes with theories of critics like William Nitze[21] who regard thirteenth- and fourteenth-century

---

[20] Wharey, p. 66.

[21] William A. Nitze, "Sens et Matière dans les Oeuvres de Chrétien de Troyes," *Romania*, 44 (1915-1917), 14-36. Also see Charles Muscatine, *Chaucer and the French Tradition* (Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press, 1966), Chapter II, "The Courtly Tradition."

XUM

romance literature as concerned largely with the narrative representation of interior states of mind. The character caught in mental or spiritual conflict becomes the field for a specialized psychomachia. It is this explicitly psychologized version of the Psychomachia (the very name of the work always carried the implication that the soul was the locus of the battle) which is realized in much later medieval debate poetry and in Wisdom and Mankind.

Mankind, though a confusing and badly flawed play, shows clear elements of such a specialized psychomachia. One of the gravest manifestations of the play's faults is a tendency to evoke conventional motifs and then drop them without any real dramatic development. Unfortunately, the dynamics of Mankind's fall to the vices (the moment of intrigue in the play's psychomachia) offer a serious example of the play's vaporous design. In these scenes Mankind reveals two aspects of the internalized psychomachia. First, the protagonist has considerable responsibility for his own downfall. Mercy's last charge to Man before he is left to his agricultural and spiritual duties establishes an analogy between Man's coming trials and those of Job:

> ȝe may not haue yowr intent at yowr fyrst dysyere.
> Se þe grett pacyence of Job in tribulacyon;
> Lyke as þe smyth trieth ern in þe feere,
> So was he triede by Godys vysytacyon.
>
> He was of yowr nature and of yowr fragylyte;
> Folow þe steppys of hym, my own swete son,
> Ande sey as he seyde in yowr trobyll and aduersyte:
> 'Dominus dedit, Dominus abstulit; sicut sibi
> placuit, ita factum est; nomen Domini benedictum!'
> (ll. 285-292)

XUM

The speech ends with a warning that if Man does sin, he should repent soon after: "Yf ȝe dysples Gode, aske mercy anon . . ." (l. 305). Titivillus' obstruction of Man's good intent is designed to convince the hero of the futility of his spiritual ambitions. His schemes meet with instant, and seemingly unmotivated, success. But Mankind has in part precipitated his fall before the devil through his own overconfidence. Immediately after the benediction in which Mercy has expressed worry about the power of the devils who had already plagued his opening speeches, Mankind declares that he is victor over his flesh:

> Now blyssyde be Jhesu! my soull ys well sacyatt
>   Wyth Þe mellyfluose doctryne of Þis worschyppfull man.
> The rebellyn of my flesch now yt ys supperatt,
>   Thankynge be Gode of Þe commynge Þat I kam.
>   (ll. 311-314)

His encounter with New Guise, etc., tempers his confidence; but the playwright seems to suggest that Man's encounter with the three worldly vices has shaken his cocky resolution enough to make him vulnerable to Titivillus's simple antagonisms. This impression is strengthened by Mercy's speech at the end of the play where he reproaches Man for ignoring his counsel, "Mankind, ȝe were obliuyows of my doctrine monytorye" (l. 879).

A second unsatisfactorily developed vestige of internal psychomachia in Mankind is the working of despair in Man's downfall. Mercy establishes a Mankind-Job analogy early in the drama (ll. 286-93). The play uses a representation of Job's despair, or at least of his spiritual lassitude, to prompt Mankind to abandon his wheatfield and give up making the walk to church for Vespers (ll. 545-554, 581-588). Despair becomes part of the business of the plot when the evil characters frantically attempt to

XUM

seal man's doom by moving him to suicide (by hanging--a conventional symbol of despair) with the news that Mercy has not been hung for horse-stealing after all (ll. 787-805). The despair theme is then developed in a more sophisticated manner when Man is so humiliated by his wrongdoing that he refuses to believe that Mercy will forgive him (ll. 811-838). This is the one scene in the play where the doctrine and its dramatic realization are at all profound or well integrated. Generally the dramatization of this important facet of the _psychomachia_, the working in man of the sin of despair, is lost in a jumble of comic stage business and unfocused developments of short duration. The essence of the late, internalized _psychomachia_ is present in _Mankind_. In despair there is a consistent motivator for Man's spiritual troubles; but the motif is better understood by keeping one eye on the Biblical narrative of Job than by closely following the plot of _Mankind_. The vices hardly resemble the antagonists of the _psychomachia_ and their dramatic function is only incidentally related to the corruption which brings Man's fall into sin.

Wisdom is a somewhat better realization of the internalized _psychomachia_. The playwright seems to have given more thought to the doctrinal objectives of his play and consequently has better adapted the morality drama conventions. The usual mankind figure is abandoned; instead, the human figure is divided into _Anima_, Mind, Will, Understanding, and a non-speaking group termed the Five Wits. The cast is clearly conceived to permit a more explicit dramatization of the temptation, fall, and purification of man. Wisdom's long opening dialogue with _Anima_ introduces all the components of man and explains (in a sophisticated manner reminiscent of the teachings of Thomistic epistemology) the functions and interactions of Mind, Will, and Understanding. Wisdom's final charge (very similar in function to that of Mercy in Mankind) warns the Three Mights of the very temptations to which they will succumb:

Ande abowe all Þis ȝe haue free wyll;
Off Þat be ware befor all thynge,
For yff Þat perverte, all Þis dothe spyll.

Ye haue thre enmyes; of hem be ware:
The Worlde, Þe Flesche, and Þe Fende.
Yowr fywe wyttys from hem ȝe spare,
That Þe sensualyte Þey brynge not yow byhynde.
Nothynge xulde offende Gode in no kynde;
Ande yff Þer do, se Þat Þe nether parte of resone
In no wys Þerto lende;
Than Þe ouer parte xall haue fre domynacyon.

Wan suggestyon to Þe Mynde doth apere,
Wndyrstondynge, delyght not ȝe Þerin;
Consent not, Wyll, yll lessons to lere,
Ande than suche steryngys be no syn.
Thei do but purge Þe soule wer ys suche contrauersye.
Thus in me, Wysdom, yowr werkys begynne.
Fyght and ȝe xall haue Þe crown of glory,
That ys euerlastynge joy, to be parteners Þerinne.
(ll. 290-308)

Unlike Titivillus or Mischief, the devil in Wisdom immediately addresses himself to the destruction of Man in the manner and on the principles outlined by Wisdom. Lucifer gives us a brief recapitulation of Wisdom's teaching on the nature of Man and narrates the plan of his temptation:

I know all compleccyons of a man
Werto he ys most dysposyde;
Ande Þerin I tempte ay-whan;
I marre hys myndys to Þer wan,
That whoo ys hym Þat God hym began;
(ll. 343-347)

In Þe soule ben thre partyes iwys:
Mynde, Wyll, Wndyrstondynge of blys,
Fygure of Þe Godhede, I know well thys;
And Þe flesche of man Þat ys so changeable
That wyll I tempte, as I gees;
Thow Þat I perwert, synne non ys
But yff Þe Soule consent to mys,
For in Þe Wyll of Þe Soule the dedys ben damnable.

> To Þe Mynde of Þe Soule I xall mak suggestyun,
> And brynge hys Wndyrstondynge to dylectacyon,
> So Þat hys Wyll make confyrmacyon;
>   Than am I sekyr inowe
> That dethe xall sew of damnacyon;
> Than of Þe Sowll Þe Dewll hath dominacyon.
> I wyll go make hys examynacyon,
>   To all Þe dewllys of helle I make awow.
> (ll. 357-372)

True to the devil's designs, Mind is first persuaded to abandon the contemplative life. Understanding quickly follows suit and Will follows the judgments of Mind and Understanding. The sins in which the Three Mights then indulge are selected to correspond to the human faculties which each represents. The spiritual reawakening is achieved when Wisdom brings the now befouled *Anima* to Mind. The character is horrified at the sight of its soul. Mind describes the experience as a mental envisioning, "A, lorde! now I brynge to mynde/ My horryble synnys and myn offens . . ." (ll. 925-6). The lesson is driven home when each of the Three Mights, having listened to a final instructive speech by Wisdom, turns to *Anima* and gives its appropriate interpretation of Wisdom's teaching. The *psychomachia* cycle of grace, temptation, fall, repentence, and restitution is complete. What makes the psychological battle in *Wisdom* most interesting is the actual conversion of the Three Mights into the representations of the sins to which they have fallen. Lucifer's role is brief in this play. While he is instrumental in the temptation, he has no role in the life in sin. By placing responsibility for most of the weaknesses and sinfulness on the Mankind figures, *Wisdom's* internalized *psychomachia* achieves a new sort of doctrinal realism; one which *Mankind* seems to envision but fails to realize.

XUM

Everyman lacks a clear representation of the psychomachia. Some critics have argued that the play focuses on man's experience after the psychomachia is finished.[22] But such a view of Everyman seems contrived. The play gives no evidence of such a battle having occurred and Everyman's quest for a true companion seems in itself to be a potent awakening experience for the character. The protagonist's experiences within the play are sufficient to bring him to the happy reckoning he finally enjoys. Rather than attempting to force Everyman into a psychomachia pattern it is better to recognize that the play lacks any real structures of antagonism between the hero's good and bad friends. The play focuses rather on the faulty material values and inclinations of Everyman. Only Goods is really portrayed as inimical to the well-being of Everyman's soul; and this character is decidedly lacking in antagonism. Indeed, it is Goods who gives Everyman the scrap of insight he needs to go to Good Deeds for aid (ll. 429-434). Everyman is not conceived within the psychomachia tradition. It uses the traditional distinction between salvific and damning human activities; but it does not show such elements in competition, allegorized or internalized, for man's soul.

In summary, the principle of contraries inherent in the Psychomachia is a commonplace in some morality plays and much sermon literature. Prudentius' work was based on an interior psychological dynamism. His allegory proposed that there are good and bad forces or alternatives in competition for man's devotion and the direction in which man exercises his will determines the fate of his soul. This theme is fundamental to the design of all the morality plays.

---

[22] Roberts, p. 102.

Just as fundamental a principle of morality play and sermon invention is the conventional opposition of the soul and the body. Wisdom contains a lengthy explication of this trope and enforces its importance by creating the character Anima as but one facet of a composite Mankind character. The protagonist in Mankind, moreover, comes on stage lamenting the discord between the foul inclinations of his body and the spiritual desires of his soul (ll. 186-216). It is this very conflict which prompts him to seek out Mercy the priest for counsel. Castel speaks freely of Man's concern for his soul and after Man's last cry for mercy his body expires and Soul crawls out from under his bed in the Castel of Perseverance. Castel's Soul has only a small role in the play, but the bit of stage business with the soul emphasizes the temporal division of man's existence. Man becomes soul alone after he has sealed the fate of that soul by his earthly existence. It is again Everyman which virtually ignores this traditional trope; the dramatic economy of the work apparently does not permit such nuances.

These two dichotomies (the psychomachia and the soul-body debate) are the key materials from which the morality plays are crafted. They are also the most popular topics for medieval sermons. Conflict was inherent in an allegorical portrayal of man's efforts to choose between virtue and vice or the demands of his body as opposed to those of his soul. The artes praedicandi acknowledge their popularity. The later treatises make room in sermon theory for more extensive use of the conflict themes.

For example, Simon Alcok's lengthy discussion of historia (pp. 211-27) permitted anecdotes, exempla, and legends to relate symbolic conflicts between these traditional combatants. Later we shall see that these oppositions generate other dichotomies which function in the imagery of the plays.

As in the inventio of the morality of plays, the principle of contraries in elocutio far exceeds the influence of the artes praedicandi. The difference is that while the handbooks and plays share a common background for their inventio, and the dispositio employs sermon techniques, the elocutio of the plays takes the usage of the sermons and expands it to a degree unimagined in the artes. This study will limit itself to the employments of contraries which can be clearly related to the sermon manuals.

The plays use contraries most effectively in dispositio where they make extensive use of the sermon device of correction (sup. pp. 73-67). The artes praedicandi stipulate that the preacher should never speak too long about the vices without proposing the virtues as correctives (sup. p. 73). All the morality dramatists take this counsel literally.

The Everyman playwright makes good use of correction. The play is arranged in two parts (surprisingly, of exactly equal length, 462 lines). Part one shows Everyman travelling from one false friend to the next. Finally, on the harshly delivered advice of Goods, the most evil of Everyman's false friends, the protagonist turns to his true friends for help with his reckoning. The cast of the play is sharply divided between those characters who refuse to help Everyman with his reckoning and those who agree to help. The drama of Everyman's experience is enhanced by the ultimate desertion of all the hero's friends except Good Deeds. The true friends accompany Everyman to the brink of his grave but they cannot go further. The play's pattern of refusal and consent, itself a corrective design, is further clarified by the graveside "desertion" of all the true friends except Good Deeds.[23]

It is the Doctor in Everyman who most clearly practices sermonic correction. In a concluding speech the Doctor tells us what Everyman's fate would have been if he had not repented and cleared his accounts. The corrective nature of the speech finds emphasis in the employment of Latin Scripture for the unfavorable judgment:

> If his rekenynge be not clere when he doth come
> God will saye (ite maledicti, in ignem eternum)
> (ll. 914-915)

In this play, where there is so little Latin quotation, the Doctor's use of Scripture for correction seems designed to be especially memorable. Doctor's speech (ll. 902-921), which balances the salutation of the Messenger (ll. 1-21), is preceded by the ecstatic speech of the Angel (ll. 894-89). This speech counterbalances the harsh judgment which God delivers after the Messenger's beginning (ll. 22-63). At the opening when Messenger assures us that the play will end happily, God throws the outcome into doubt. Similarly, Doctor's speech at the play's end tempers the euphoria created by Everyman's ascent to heaven (which is expressed in the Angel's rejoicing).

---

[23] Thomas F. Van Laan discusses the two-part structure of Everyman in an article (with which I have many serious disagreements) where he terms them patterns of descent and ascent: "Everyman: A Structural Analysis," PMLA, 78 (1963), 465-475.

XUM

Another, less profound, use of sermonic correction in Everyman occurs in Knowledge's digression on bad priests (ll. 749-70). The play, especially at this point in its development, places great stress on the value of the Sacraments, even when the minister of them is unworthy. The vexed canon law issue of whether Sacraments were valid when administered by sinning priests was a topic of great discussion throughout the later Middle Ages.[24] Knowledge, who after all was instrumental in sending Everyman to Priesthood, shows a perverse circumspection in noting the problem of wicked priests administering Sacraments. The episode must have been motivated by an unfortunate preacherly compulsion to examine the obverse of smoothly accomplished action.

Castel of Perseverance practices sermonic correction in the stern speeches of Truth and Righteousness in the "Parliament of the Four Daughters of God" at the play's conclusion. Lest the audience believe that Man's late cry of "Mercy" is a safe means to salvation for themselves, the author puts Mercy's victory in the "Parliament" in doubt in the speeches of Truth and Righteousness (ll. 3249-3319, 3379-3443).

The clearest instances of opposites used for correction occur in Mankind and Wisdom. In Mankind the protagonist is brought to sin and then to despair by the vice characters. When Mercy returns to the stage Man believes that he is unworthy of forgiveness and will not repent. Mankind explains, "The egall justyse of God wyll not permytte sych a synfull wrech/

---

[24] See, for example, the discussion of Gabriel Biel's position on late medieval Donatism in Heiko Oberman, The Harvest of Medieval Theology (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1967), pp. 220-22.

XUM

To be rewyvyd and restoryd ageyn; yt were impossibyll" (ll. 831-32). But Mercy persuades Man to ask pardon. Once the protagonist is restored to a life of virtue the playwright immediately begins the work of correction. Fearful that his audience may understand Mankind to argue that sins are not serious if repentance follows quickly, the author launches a small spiritual dialogue between Man and his mentor on the nature of mercy. Mercy gives a good summary of the discussion:

> Aryse now and go wyth me in thys deambulatorye.
> Inclyne yowyr capacite; my doctrine ys conuenient.
> Synne not in hope of mercy; þat ys a cryme notary.
> To truste ouermoche in a prince yt ys not expedient.
>
> In hope when ʒe syn ʒe thynke to hawe mercy, be ware of þat awenture.
> The good Lord seyd to þe lecherus woman of Chanane,
> The holy gospell ys þe awtorite, as we rede in scrypture,
> 'Vade et jam amplius noli peccare.'
>
> Cryst preserwyd þis synfull woman takeyn in awowtry;
> He seyde to here þeis wordys, 'Go and syn no more.'
> So to ʒow, go and syn no more. Be ware of weyn confidens of mercy;
> Offend not a prince on trust of hys fauour, as I seyd before.
>
> (ll. 843-54)

In Wisdom the sermonic correction is still more obvious. The play has portrayed a sophisticated temptation of Mind, Will, and Understanding. Lucifer, by means of false reason, convinced the Three Mights that their practice of the contemplative life was a futile undertaking. The devil's most potent argument persuades Mind:

> Contemplatyff lyff for to sewe
> Yt ys grett drede, and se cause why:
> They must fast, wake, and prey, euer new,
> Wse harde lywynge and goynge wyth dyscyplyne dew,
> Kepe sylence, wepe, and surphettys eschewe,
> Ande yff þey fayll of thys þey offende Gode hyghly.

XUM

Wan Þey haue wastyde by feyntnes,
Than febyll Þer wyttys and fallyn to fondnes,
Sum into dyspeyer and sum into madnes.
  Wet yt well, God ys not plesyde wyth thys.
Lewe, lewe, suche syngler besynes.
Be in Þe worlde, vse thyngys nesesse.
The comyn ys best expres.
  Who clymyt hye, hys fall gret ys.
(ll. 431-445)

The dramatist must have believed that the outcome of events in his play was not an adequate refutation of Lucifer's sophistry. In the play's closing lines Wisdom steps forward and delivers a speech on "nyne poyntes," every one of which deals with the superiority of the sensible practice of virtue. Wisdom is explaining, nine times, the flaw in the devil's reasoning. The first two points are adequate demonstration:

Thus seth Gode mankynde tyll
  The nyne poyntys ples hym all other before.
'Gyff a peny in thy lyve wyth goode wyll
  To Þe pore, and Þat plesythe Gode more
  Þan mowyntenys into golde tramposyde wore
    Ande aftyr they dethe for the dysposyde.'
  Ande all Þe goodys Þou hast in store
    Xulde not profyght so moche wan Þi body ys closyde.

The secunde poynt, Gode sethe thus:
  'Wepe on tere for my loue hertyly,
Or for Þe passyon of me, Jhesus,
  Ande Þat plesyt me more specyally
  Then yff Þou wepte for Þi frendys or goodys worldly
    As moche water as Þe se conteynys.'
  Lo, contrycyon ys a soueren remedy.
    That dystroythe synnys, Þat relessyt peynys.
(ll. 997-1012)

The antagonism of good and bad characters receives great attention in the dispositio of the morality plays, too. The playwrights are careful to contrast the costumes, manner, and speeches of good and evil characters. Speech inversions and speech patterning are the authors' favorite means of portraying the relationships of the good and bad characters. This use of contraries again receives embellishment in its transition from sermon to play. The difference serves to point out the literary license a playwright enjoyed in comparison to the restrictions of time and decorum placed on the preacher. The playwrights were not confined to the thematic structure of the sermons. In consequence, they could realize the opposing materia of the plays in their arrangement or disposition.

The spare balance of Everyman's design has been discussed elsewhere. The plot is arranged in a pattern of repetition with variation which encourages the comparison of part one with part two. Episodes are arranged in repeating patterns and crucial elements are emphasized by inverting the dramatic patterns. In the downward action of part one Everyman interviews three false friends who refuse to help him at his judgment. The hero begins part two by going to a fourth friend, Good Deeds, with the same request he used in part one. The pattern of part one is sustained when Good Deeds declines to accompany Everyman; but the design shows a significant alteration when Good Deeds explains his refusal and suggests a positive course of action for the hero. From this point the play's action rises and more friends join Everyman until he draws up to the grave. Then the pattern of desertion is resumed until only Good Deeds remains to accompany Everyman to death. The action of part two is an expanded repetition of part one. It both parallels part one and offers a significant contrast to it. The plot is comprised of a repeating series of interviews where Everyman asks his friend if he will come to his reckoning. Between the interviews of part one and the graveside interviews of part two is an important

XUM

penitential interlude. This mid-section discusses and exemplifies the power of the Sacraments and works enough alteration on the character of Everyman to permit him to change his reaction to the desertions of part two. In part one Everyman had approached desperation when his third friend, Goods, refused to join his pilgrimage. In part two Everyman is distressed that Beauty and the other good friends will desert him; but when he asks Knowledge if he too will refuse to come to the grave with him, he is only saddened at Knowledge's reply. Perhaps because his penitence has earned him one everlasting friend in Good Deeds, Everyman is quite sanguine about his relative isolation in the grave.

A less dramatic balance of design is employed in *Wisdom*. The play, as previously remarked, is much more expository than are the other moralities. Moderately sophisticated concepts of spiritual life and epistemology are used in *Wisdom*'s plot. Nonetheless, opposition of characters is achieved in a most unusual fashion. Scholars who have studied Wisdom's performance speculate that the play was presented by a travelling group of only five actors. Extras for the play's several tableaux were hired in the town where the play was enacted.[25] According to David Bevington the multiple-casting that such a performance would require was planned so that the doubling itself contributed to the play's moral lesson. The principle of design in this casting was contraries. First examining the arguments of the play, Bevington extracts the following chart. It reveals "the symmetry of corresponding concepts in the play's thought and characterization:"[26]

---

[25] Merle Fifield believes there were six speaking actors. She suggests that each mime troupe must have had a professional actor as a marshal. ["The Use of Doubling and 'Extras' in *Wisdom Who is Christ*," *Ball State University Forum*, 6 (1965), 66-67.]

(1) Soul in Innocence		(2) Temptation & Fall	
Mind	Father	Faith → Devil	Suggestion
Understanding	Son	Hope → World	Delight
Will	Holy Ghost	Charity → Flesh	Consent
(3) Life in Sin		**(3) Repentence & Salvation**	
Pride	Maintenance	Force → Confession	Perfection
Covetousness	Perjury	Deceit → Contrition	Truth
Lust	Lechery	Prodigality → Satisfaction	Chastity

If five actors played all the speaking parts in Wisdom the doubling would occur as follows:[27]

	Forces of Good		Forces of Evil
Player 1		Anima	
Player 2	Wisdom (Christ)		Lucifer
Player 3	Mind		Maintenance
Player 4	Will		Lechery
Player 5	Understanding		Perjury
6 boy supernumeraries	5 wits (virgins)		6 retainers of Maintenance, Lechery, Perjury; 6 devils

The stage directions of the play clearly indicate that Mind, Will, and Understanding perform as Maintenance, Lechery, and Perjury in their life-in-sin. The arrangement of speaking parts does not permit Wisdom and Lucifer to share the stage; so such doubling was very likely. The consequence of this dramatic economy is a vivid, if ironic, stage reinforcement of the opposition of the play's good and evil characters. In short, it seems to be a stroke of genius inspired by necessity.

---

[26] Bevington, p. 126.

[27] Bevington, p. 127.

It is probably the lack of a soundly balanced scheme of opposing characters in Mankind that has caused critics regularly to dismiss this morality as a degenerate example of its genre. Mischief is an unworthy opponent for the sententious Mercy. Titivillus' antagonism does not actually touch Mercy and his role in the play is limited to a brief episode of chicanery. He does not have a speech of the dimensions of Wisdom's Lucifer, which shows him as the profound arch-enemy of Man. Even his name fails to command fearful respect.[28] Despite the low stature of Man's enemies, Mercy tries to array the antagonists in a familiar morality play scheme. But his speech does not come until the end of the play and seems more like an afterthought (ll. 879-898). The comic impressions of New Guise, Nowadays, and Nought as pranksters and of Titivillus as the play's money-making spectacle (Mischief, like a ringmaster, delays the devil's appearance until the audience has contributed enough money, ll. 451-474) are difficult to correct so late in the drama.

Like so many other morality play characteristics, schemes of opposing characters receive fullest expression in Castel of Perseverance. A great portion of the play's opening speeches is concerned with charting the interrelationship of the play's many characters. The Flagbearers devote several stanzas of the banns to an explanation of the relationship of Man to the Good Angel and the Bad Angel. The chief evil forces are also designated and the specific pairings of vices and virtues are listed. The whole scheme is unfolded in a more dramatic fashion in the play itself. According to the stage plan which accompanies the Castel manuscript, each of the chief evils, World, Flesh, and Devil, has a scaffold from which he speaks. The first 274 lines of Castel are divided into three speeches, three stanzas long, delivered by each of these co-equal evils. (It should be noted here that Covetousness also has a scaffold but he is not one of the chief vices.) While the speeches are all basically boasts or battle vaunts, the characters do mention their chief subservient vices. At line 275 Man appears on stage and in four stanzas he describes his pathetic state and his company of two angels.

---

[28] Eccles, n. M 301, notes that "Only in Mankind is [Titivillus] more than a minor devil."

Once the allegiances and hierarchy of all the good and evil characters are clearly established, the exposition fades into dramatic discourse with the introductory speeches of the Good and Bad Angels. It has often been observed that the proportion of good to evil characters in the main (psychomachia) part of this play is not balanced. Nor are the number of lines spoken by good or evil characters at all equal; the speeches of the evil characters are more plentiful and often longer than those of the virtues. Nonetheless, the composition of the play gives the impression of balance. Good and Bad Angel are the best example of this balancing. Only in the battle scene where each angel is serving as a field commander for his forces is the symmetry of angelic speeches broken. Elsewhere the speech of one angel is an occasion for the speech of the other. This pairing of speeches, an obvious use of sermonic correction, often violates the play's dramatic realism (e.g., when Man seals his bargain with World and joins Covetousness, ll. 789-814). In a speech not related to the stage business Good Angel delivers a lament which ends with an aside to the audience. Bad Angel, who has not been active in drama for 470 lines, is standing next to the Good Angel and disputes the closing words of his speech. The impression that Bad Angel is an interloper in this scene is confirmed when Good Angel, apparently ignoring his counterpart, goes into a repetitive and rhythmical lament on the fall of man:

So mekyl þe werse, weleawoo,
  Þat euere good aungyl was ordeynyd þe.
Þou art rewlyd aftyr þe fende þat is þi foo
  And noþynge certys aftyr me.
Weleaway, wedyr may I goo?
  Man doth me bleykyn blody ble.
Hys swete sowle he wyl now slo.
                                        (ll. 1260-1265)

I am abowte boþe day and nyth
To brynge hys sowle into blis bryth,
  And hymself wyl it brynge to pyne.

MALUS ANGELUS. No, Good Aungyl, þou art not in sesun,
  Few man in þe feyth þey fynde.
For þou hast schewyd a ballyd resun,
  Good syre, cum blowe myn hol behynde.
Trewly man hathe non chesun
  On þi God to grede and grynde,
                                        (ll. 1269-1278)

  In penaunce hys body he muste bynde
  And forsake þe worldys mende.
Men arn loth on þe to crye
Or don penaunce for here folye.
Þerfore haue I now maystrye
  Welny ouyr al mankynde.

> BONUS ANGELUS. Alas, Mankynde
> Is bobbyd and blent as þe blynde.
> In feyth, I fynde,
> To Crist he can nowt be kynde.
> (ll. 1281-1291)

Good and Bad Angel are the play's twins. They speak in sequence regardless of where they are or what they are doing on *Castel*'s stage.

Once the playwright has established such elaborate schemes of repetition and parallelism, he can rely upon the viewer's expectations to achieve some significant reversals of those patterns. The most dramatic reversal of speech patterns occurs when the vices attempt to bring Man out of the Castel of Perseverance. Each vice assualts his appropriate virtue. She refutes him and he is driven back. A rigid prosodic pattern is established. After the sixth vice is routed World rages and Covetousness speaks unctuously to Man. Largess recognizes the changed attack and is immediately dismayed (ll. 2414-65). The only dramatic justification within the play is Covetousness's change of addressee to Man himself. The speech design has not changed. The vice has spoken one stanza; the virtue speaks two. The change in the vice's addressee is the modest but telling alteration which leads to the play's most significant reversal.[29]

---

[29] It should be noted that I am distinguishing between dramatic justifications of action and those related to the play's conceptual or allegorical universe. Considerations of plot aside, it is logical that Covetousness should prevail over Largess. This sin was the most rampant and powerful of human temptations in the view of many late medieval preachers and writers. [J.W. McCutchan, "Covetousness in *The Castel of Perseverance*," *University of Virginia Studies*, 4 (Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1951), pp. 175-191.] The *Castel* playwright certainly elevates Covetousness above the other vices in this play.

A second example of this patterning that precipitates reversals occurs itself within a repetitive design. There are two moments in Castel when Man cries "Mercy." Both are motivated by a lancing or pricking. First, Penance sticks Man with his spear and Man, who a moment before had scorned confession, now speaks of Mercy:

A sete of sorwe in me is set;
  Sertys for synne I syhe sore.
Mone of mercy in me is met;
  For werldys myrþe I morne more.
In wepynge wo my wele is wet.
  Mercy, þou muste myn stat astore.
Fro our lordys lyth þou hast me let,
  Sory synne, þou grysly gore,
    Owte on þe, dedly synne!
   Synne, þou haste Mankynde schent.
   In dedly synne my lyfe is spent.
   Mercy, God omnipotent!
     In ȝoure grace I begynne.
(ll. 1402-1415)

The pricking ultimately brings Man to confession and then to the Castel. Penance's appearance had been precipitated by Good Angel's especially sad lament, which was in turn evoked by an especially irreligious discussion between Man and Sloth. Sloth advised Man:

Lappe þyne hed þanne in a cloth
  And take a swet, I þe rede,
    Chyrche-goynge þou forsake.
   Losengerys in londe I lyfte
   And dyth men to mekyl vnthryfte.
   Penaunce enjoynyd men in schryfte
    Is vndone, and þat I make.
(ll. 1214-1220)

Man assents and explains that his sinfulness is no worse than that of all other men and that he knows no one who would forsake his favorite of the seven sins:

My prowd pouer schal I not pende
  Tyl I be putte in peynys pyt,
  To helle hent fro hens.
In dale of dole tyl we are downe
We schul be clad in a gay gowne.
I se no man but þey vse somme
  Of þese seuene dedly synnys.

XUM

For comounly it is seldom seyne,
  Whoso now be lecherows
But of oþyr men he schal haue dysdeyne
  And ben prowde or covetous.
    In synne iche man is founde.
  Þer is pore nor ryche, be londe ne lake,
  Þat alle þese seuene wyl forsake,
  But wyth on or oþyr he schal be take
    And in here byttyr bondys bownde.
(ll. 1244-1259)

A more serious blasphemy precipitates the second pricking, Death's dart, and the cry "mercy" which eventually admits Man to heaven. Man tells Covetousness:

Qwenche neuere no man may;
  Me þynkyth neuere I haue inow.
Þer ne is werldys wele, nyth nor day,
  But þat me thynkyth it is to slow.
'More and more' ȝit I say
  And schal euere whyl I may blow;
On Coveytyse is al my lay
  And schal tyl deth me ouyrthrow.
  'More and more', þis is my steuene.
If I myth alwey dwellyn in prosperyte,
Lord God, þane wel were me.
I wolde, þe medys, forsake þe
  And neuere to comyn in heuene.
(ll. 2765-2777)

Both examples show Man settling comfortably into his sinfulness. When he grows confident and begins to scorn the Church as an institution or its specific teachings, his momentum is stopped by a lance or by pricking which reminds him he needs mercy. When the hero seriously endangers his soul the pattern of pricking is instituted to reverse the course of action abruptly. As if for emphasis, Castel repeats an episode which explicitly contrasts Man's two spiritual states.

The use of contraries is evident in the elocutio of the morality plays as well as in the categories of inventio and dispositio. Examples

XUM

are plentiful. At the root of the use of contraries in morality elocutio (and probably in the fifteenth-century sermon, as well) is the nature of flamboyant style. Helmut Hatzfeld's general description of this epoch style was quoted earlier. Another writer, studying Castel of Perseverance, has further stressed the antithetical nature of this style which is typical of all the moralities, but especially of the Macro plays: "The essence of flamboyant style . . . is its ornamental use of the plain style of direct realistic description in a merger with those rhetorical devices appropriate to the ornate, grand or high style."[30] The author sees flamboyant style realized in Castel primarily in the anomaly of abstract concepts portrayed allegorically by realistic, often earthy, characters. Mankind's homely and proverbial speech and the vices' occasional vulgarity and their continual realistic stage business supply the main examples of this style. But flamboyance is also realized in the juxtaposition of radically different speech patterns. In the discussion of authority (Chapter III) it was observed that the Mankind character speaks a colloquial and proverbial language when he is in sin. When he is in grace, or at least not in sin, he speaks in the Scripture-quoting, often aureated, manner of the good and angelic characters of the moralities. In addition, the prosody of these passages differs greatly. Mankind in sin speaks in brief, alliterative lines. The words are short and the verse rhythm is uneven. In contrast, Mankind in grace speaks in flowing, polysyllabic terms of French and Latin origin. He uses little alliteration; but he does employ much homosoteleuton.

---

[30] Kelley, p. 17.

Instances of these contrasting speech patterns abound in the plays (with the exception of Everyman). Examples from Mankind and Wisdom will illustrate the practice. When still innocent Mankind first sets out to till his field after Mercy leaves him, he speaks with ornate dignity:

Now blyssyde be Jhesu! my soull ys well sacyatt
  Wyth þe mellyfluose doctryne of þis worschyppfull man.
The rebellyn of my flesch now yt ys superatt,
  Thankynge be Gode of þe commynge þat I kam.

Her wyll I sytt and tytyll in þis papyr
  The incomparable astat of my promycyon.
Worschypfull souerence, I haue wretyn here
  The gloryuse remembrance of my nobyll condycyon.
(Mankind, ll. 311-318)

But when Man is seduced by Titivillus his first speech jangles with exclamations and rather common diction:

Whope who! Mercy hath brokyn hys neke-kycher, avows,
Or he hangyth by þe neke hye wppon þe gallouse.
Adew, fayer masters! I wyll hast me to þe ale-house
  Ande speke wyth New Gyse, Nowadays and Nought
And geett me a lemman wyth a smattrynge face.
(ll. 607-611)

In Wisdom the speech of the Three Mights shows similar patterning. Mind's speech does not have the extensive aureation found in the lines of Wisdom and Anima. Nonetheless, his early expository speeches achieve a dignified middle style:

I am Mynde, þat in þe sowle ys
The veray fygure of þe Deyte.
Wen in myselff I haue mynde and se
  The benefyttys of Gode and hys worthynes,
How holl I was mayde, how fayere, how fre,
  How gloryus, how jentyll to hys lyknes,

XUM

Thys insyght bryngyt to my mynde
  Wat grates I ough to God ageyn
Þat thus hathe ordenyde wythowt ende
  Me in hys blys euer for to regne.
  Than myn insuffycyens ys to me peyn
    That I haue not werof to yelde my dett,
  Thynkynge myselff creature most veyn;
    Than for sorrow my bren I knett.
                    (ll. 183-196)

After the Three Mights assent to Lucifer's arguments Mind's speech takes on the short rhythyms and colloquial expressions found in the speech of corrupted Mankind:

Lo, me here in a new aray!
Wyppe, wyrre, care awey!
  Farwell perfeccyon!
Me semyt myselff most lyghly ay.
It ys but honest, no pryde, no nay.
I wyll be freshest, by my fay,
    For þat acordyt wyth my complexccyon.
                    (ll. 552-557)[31]

Castel of Perseverance does not employ contrasting diction to the extent found in the other Macro plays. There is almost no comic stage business in this play and while the vices converse with their traditional vigor they maintain an extraordinarily dignified level of speech. In the passages most likely to show comic or plain speech the author retains a remarkable sophistication in the speech of the vices. When World learns that Man has retreated to the Castel he rages at his loss, summons Covetousness, and in a fury begins to berate and cudgel his most skillfull deputy. The exchange commences:

AUARICIA. Syr bolnynge bowde,
Tell me why blowe ȝe so lowde!

MUNDUS. Lewde losel, þe Deuel þe brenne!
  I prey God ȝeue þe a fowl hap!
Sey, why letyst þou Mankind

---

[31] For an extended discussion of patterns of diction in Wisdom see Koontz, pp. 49,90, 145 ff. and passim.

XUM

Into ȝene castel for to skape?
  I trowe þou gynnyst to raue.
Now, for Mankynd is went,
Al oure game is schent.
þerfore a sore dryuynge dent,
  Harlot, þou schalt haue.
(ll. 1853-1876)

There is little contrast between this speech and the delivery of Largess when Man first commits himself to the Castel of Perseverance. The virtue's speech of welcome is one of a series delivered by each virtue. It is highly expository and has little relation to any stage business:

In Largyte, man, ley þi loue.
  Spende þi good, as God it sent.
In worchep of hym þat syt above
  Loke þi goodys be dyspent.
In dale of dros whanne þou schalt droue
  Lytyl loue is on þe lent;
þe sekatourys schul seyn it is here behoue
  To make us mery, for he is went
    þat al þis good gan owle.
  Ley þi tresour and þy trust
  In place where no ruggynge rust
  May it dystroy to dros ne dust
    But al to helpe of sowle.
(ll. 1654-1666)

While the diction of thw two speeches differs, their prosody is remarkably similar.

In contrast to the plays, the preaching manuals do not devote much attention to the nuances of elocutio. The handbooks generally refer their readers to Cicero or the Rhetorica ad Herennium for instruction on such matters (e.g., Robert of Basevorn, p. 211). Nonetheless, the sermon manuals do occasionally urge a preacher to suit the style of his speech to the audience he is addressing and to adapt the tone and diction of his sermon to the sorts of authorities or topics he is treating. The importance of a well-modulated elocutio was familiar to the preachers, but their handbooks did not specifically urge them to contrast styles of speech.

Contrast of speech in Everyman is of a different sort from that used in the Macro plays. It deals with word imagery rather than with prosody. It is also more closely related to sermon practice. This play, while it is a good example of plain, functional English prose (as A.C. Cawley noted[32]), shows little interest in modulating its style for purposes of characterization. Instead, the evenness of the play's prosody lends a gravity to the drama which the Macro moralities cannot achieve. But there are a few instances in Everyman where speeches are contrasted for thematic purposes.

The main speech contrast employed in the play is achieved through repetition of speech patterns and single lines. The effect of such a practice is grim irony. When Everyman is seeking true friends to accompany him to the grave he receives a pledge of friendship-till-death from each character. The irony of the cliché is keenly apparent after the first friend, Fellowship, reneges on his pledge as soon as he realizes that Everyman wants to take his promise literally. Fellowship promises:

> My true frende shewe to me your mynde
> I wyll not forsake the to my lyues end
> In the waye of good company.
> (11. 212-214)

---

[32] A. C. Cawley, ed., Everyman (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1961), p. xxiv. See also T.S. Eliot, "Four Elizabethan Dramatists," in Selected Essays (London: Faber and Faber, 1951), p. 111.

XUM

> Syr, I must nedes knowe your heuynesse
> I haue pyte to se you in ony dystresse
> If ony haue you wronged ye shall reuenged be
> Thoughe I on the grounde be slayne for the
> Though that I knowe before that I shoulde dye.
> (ll. 216-220)

Everyman replies:

> Than be you a good frende at nede
> I haue founde you true here before.
> (ll. 229-230)

Everyman's second friend, Cousin, repeats this theme:

> Ye euery man and to vs declare
> Yf ye be dysposed to go ony whyder
> For, wete you well wyll lyue and dye to gyder.
> (ll. 322-324)

But Goods's reply to Everyman's summons makes significant changes in the pattern of refusals:

> Sir & ye i[n] the worlde have sorowe or aduersyte
> That can I help you to remedy shortly.
> (ll. 401-402)

Because of Everyman's previous disappointments we (and Everyman) are now quite sensitive to Goods's qualifier, "in the worlde." When Everyman begins to seek help from his good friends the "unto death" pledges abruptly cease. Professing weakness, Good Deeds refuses to go anywhere with Everyman. Only Knowledge pledges, "Euery man I wyll go with the and be thy gyde,/ In they moost nede to go by thy syde." (ll. 522-523). When Beauty, Strength, Discretion, and Five Wits promise to accompany Everyman their promises are clearly limited. None, except Beauty, promises to go "unto death" with Everyman. All stress their support in adversity. Only Beauty's promise resembles those of the false friends:

XUM

> No more wyll I [depart] vnto dethes houre
> What so euer therof befall.
> (ll. 688-689)

And, appropriately, it is Beauty, blurting an indecorous proverb, who suddenly abandons Everyman at graveside. Other friends also desert the hero but they do so with regret and dignity. The pattern of repetition and contrast in this play is most clearly focused when Everyman turns to his one utterly true friend, Good Deeds, and hears a line he had spoken first to fickle Fellowship, here repeated. Good Deeds pledges:

> I wyll not forsake the in dede
> Thou shalte fynde me a good frende at nede.
> (ll. 853-854)

The patterns of inverted repetition and reversal, like so much of the craftmanship of this play, are subtle and well-concealed. The patterns are, nonetheless, persistent.

Other images in *Everyman* involving contraries deal mostly with the pilgrimage motif. Everyman is preparing for a journey. When Cousin declines Everyman's invitation he pleads a "cramp in my toe" (l. 356). The comic demurrer focuses on the ambulatory nature of the hero's undertaking. The image is worked more seriously in Goods's reply to Everyman's summons. Like the buried talents of the New Testament parable, Goods is immobile:

> I lye here in corners trussed and pyled so hye
> And in chestes I am locked so fast
> Also sacked in bagges thou mayst se with thyn eye
> I can not styre in packes lowe I lye
> (ll. 394-397)

XUM

Similarly, Good Deeds is bound and fettered and cannot travel with Everyman:

> Here I lye colde in the grounde
> Thy synnes hath me sore bounde
> That I can not stere.
> (ll. 486-488)
>
> I wolde full fayne but I can not stande veryly.
> (l. 498)

When Everyman repents, Good Deeds is cured:

> I thanke god now I can walke and go
> And am delyuered of my sykenesse and wo
> Therfore with euery man I wyll go and not spare
> His good workes I wyll helpe hym to declare.
> (ll. 619-622)

The imagery receives a sudden, ironic reversal when Everyman comes to the grave. Every friend except Good Deeds refuses to accompany the protagonist to the grave. Most explain that they are incapable of making the journey that Everyman must take. Their refusals deal with inabilities to walk. But when the real journey into death begins Everyman declares:

> Alas I am so faynt I may not stande
> My lymmes vnder me doth folde
> Frendes let vs not [illegible]rne agayne to this lande
> Not for all the worldes golde
> For in to this caue must I crepe
> And tourne to erth, and there to slepe.
> (ll. 788-793)

The realism of Everyman's inability to walk at death is a powerful contrast to the play's more traditional imagery which views human life as a pilgrimage. The reversal of the trope in part stresses the opposite nature of death to life. The idea of a pilgrimage in which a man cannot walk underlines the fearful strangeness of the travail man must undertake at his end. It also emphasizes the frivolity of the excuses false friends made to Everyman at the play's beginning. Perhaps it is unwise to expect a precise employment (or reversal) of so traditional an image in this play. The walking and failing motif certainly does not work consistently in Everyman (e.g., Goods and Good Deeds cannot walk for reasons very different from those of the other false friends and Everyman himself); and its reversal seems to create as many critical problems as it resolves. Nonetheless, the dramatic opposition of characters who can walk to those who cannot, and of those who are willing to walk to those who will not creates a texture of irony in Everyman which makes the hero's experiences all the more moving for the play's viewers.

In accordance with its quiet design Everyman also offers good examples of paradoxical and ironic speech and imagery patterns which suit the play's principles of opposition. All the plays exhibit a fondness in diction for simple, graphic antonyms, ironic juxtapositions, and oxymoron; and the practices of the Everyman playwright, especially, are related to the sermon device, distinctio. The author has expanded upon the previously discussed technique displayed in Alain of Lille's example (sup., pp. 78-9); he has spread the contrasting distinctions over several hundred lines; but this is because his context is a literary and dramatic one. He does not need to compress his enthymemes as a preacher must; instead, his approach is less argumentative and designed for more emotional impact than the preacher's.

Contrary images and ideas figure in the poetic designs of the Macro plays to a lesser extent than in *Everyman*. Nevertheless, allusions to some essential dichotomies do occur in the speech of *Wisdom*'s main characters. Like *Everyman*'s use of opposites in *elocutio*, *Wisdom*'s use relates to sermon *distinctio*. The central body-soul division finds several analogous antitheses in the play's *elocutio*. For example, *Wisdom* explains that the affections of the body are "fylthe and ordure" whereas Wisdom's influence on *Anima* is a purifying one (ll. 48 ff.). In the same vein Wisdom speaks of "þe fylthe of synne orygynall" (l. 111) which blemishes *Anima* from birth. Images of light and dark and black and white are invoked to contrast the soul and the body, heavenly and damned angels, and reason and sensation. Wisdom describes man's mental faculties of reason and sense:

> Thes tweyn do sygnyfye
>   Yowr dysgysynge and yowr aray,
> Blake and wyght, fowll and fayer vereyly . . . .
>   (ll. 149-151)

Anima speaks of "Þis dyrke schadow I bere of humanyte" (l. 166). The opposing themes of purity and fairness, and darkness and foulness, are dramatically realized when Lucifer assumes a disguise of brightness to tempt the Three Mights and when *Anima* appears to sinning Mind in a wretched and befouled state.

It should be noted that *Wisdom* does not attempt to make its arguments through any appeal to audience involvement. The play does not have a well-prepared peripety and it is unlikely that an audience would become so involved in the course of the play's events that it could sense fear or relief at appropriate moments. *Wisdom* is rather a play of

XUM

doctrine and eloquence. To make his doctrinal points about the nature of man's mind and body, the quality of his soul, and the constellation of enemies and saving assets which surround him, the playwright quite naturally has resorted to the traditional imagery of devotional literature and Christian philosophy. Images of light and dark, body *vs.* soul, and so on, are found in the earliest Neo-Platonist writings read by Christian writers. Plato himself used themes of light and shadow, fair and foul to describe the nature of man and his spiritual milieu. It is not, then, the *artes praedicandi* that moved *Wisdom*'s author to employ so many pairs of antithetical symbols and adjectives; but sermon theory and practice certainly shared in the accumulated wealth of contrary images in medieval religious thought upon which *Wisdom* drew.

The use of contraries in the imagery of *Mankind* occurs primarily in the yoking of unexpected opposites or inversions for local or comic effect. This play relies on the same body-soul division that forms the core of *Wisdom*; but its handling of the topic is not nearly so doctrinal or philosophical as the earlier morality. Instead, discussion in *Mankind* often concerns the style of clothing a figure wears or the nature of his speech. Just as substantial changes in styles of speech reflect changing moral states in man, so a change in the length of Mankind's coat by the three minor vices signals his succumbing to the temptation of Titivillus. This late morality play demonstrates an extensive development of sermonic *distinctio* in a dramatic frame rather than the use of opposites.

From the foregoing it should be clear that the principle of contraries is a rich but complex one for the English morality plays. Evidence of the use of contraries can be found in all the plays in their invention, arrangement, and style. Every playwright used the device to tell his audience how man could save himself; but its interpretation varied greatly. Each of the four plays is distinctive and it would be inaccurate to argue that principles of contrast serve as the key to the design of the entire genre. Nevertheless, a material tradition and a structure of thought laden with contraries and opposites coalesced when they encountered the fifteenth century's flamboyant style. Indeed, the factors contributing to such a dominant principle of design not only enhanced one another; they were probably responsible for one another's currency. Clearly, opposition was not solely derived from the instruction of the *ars praedicandi*; and the principle, in material and formal manifestations, predates the handbooks. But it must have been the sermon tradition of contrasting vices and virtues and the preferred techniques for portraying this antagonism which first suggested contraries to the morality playwrights. The suggestion, whatever its source, had profound ramifications for morality play design.

XUM

Chapter V: The Use of Sermonic Voice in the Morality Plays

The term "sermonic voice" is a coinage of the present writer. It refers to a mode of speech employed in the morality plays which is not represented by any single character in the *dramatis personae*. Instead, the sermonic voice is a rhetorical presence, functioning in the plays like a narrator, which has values and goals common to the medieval preacher. The adjective "sermonic" is used because it pinpoints the persuasive, moralistic attitude of this rhetorical presence. It will be argued in the present chapter that the "sermonic voice" in the morality plays serves as a "basic voice." The noun "voice" and the term "basic voice" are taken from the critical writings of J. Craig La Drière. La Drière argues that, "In the analysis of a speech or literary composition, nothing is more important than to determine precisely the voice or voices presented as speaking and the precise nature of the address."[1] He then divides voices in literature into four categories. Arranged from most subjective to most objective, La Drière's classifications of voice structures are: (1) single voice speech where the writer represents himself directly; (2) assumed single voice speech, as in a dramatic monologue; (3) speech with a single basic voice which may be interrupted by the speech of other characters, as in most narrative; (4) dialogue, where two or more voices are directly quoted without narrative intervention, as in drama.[2] In the suggestion that the morality drama has a basic sermonic voice, the present writer is arguing that the moralities do not adhere to our modern conceptions of drama. The colorations of the basic sermonic voice in the speech of morality play characters draw the dramas back into the realm of narrative. The ends of the basic voice dictate that the characters in these plays function rhetorically, not dramatically. It will be argued that fifteenth-century sermon theory and practice provided the model for the basic voice in the morality plays. The sermons and the dramas shared the goal of persuading an audience to live uprightly and to look to its "ending."

---

[1] J. Craig La Drière, "Voice and Address," in *Dictionary of World Literature*, ed. Joseph T. Shipley (Totowa, N.J.: Littlefield, Adams & Co., 1966), p. 441.

[2] La Drière, p. 442.

The rhetorical attributes of sermons written in the tradition of the artes praedicandi are unique. The conduct book elements in the handbooks required that the preacher convey an image of outstanding moral character; for it was argued that an impeccable reputation enhanced the credibility of the preacher. The respectability of the speaker was further protected by careful attention to his style of speech and delivery. The writers of handbooks worried lest the preacher gesture too wildly or speak too crudely or too preciously. Yet they did not want the congregation to regard its preacher with pure awe. To mitigate the authoritative presence of the preacher the artes designed an interlude in the sermon which attempted to focus the attention of a congregation on the common humanity of preacher and addressees. As noted before, the sermon's prayer does deflate the potentially lofty presence of the preacher. He is to pray before the congregation for the skill and wisdom to deliver a good sermon. He is to ask the indulgence of the listeners for any failings he may have and at the same time he is to stress that the work of the sermon can only succeed within the spirit of each member of the congregation. Rather than posing as an imperious intermediary between Eternal Wisdom and the lowly congregation, the preacher is instructed to assume a "first-among-equals" role which most identifies him with the humanity of his congregation. As a result, the preacher not only speaks in the commanding pronoun modes of "you must" and in the authoritative "I say;" he is also advised to use "let us" and "we should." This first person plural pronoun was often used to powerful persuasive advantage by later medieval preachers. (See above, pp. 86-89.)

The sermon itself relied largely upon authority for the force of its arguments (sup., pp. 59-69). Ultimately, the preacher could not depend on his personal persuasiveness to convince congregations of their need to follow his counsel. The dependence of the thematic sermon on a pre-existing, universally agreed upon source of truth meant that the sermons did not need to dispute what was good or bad. The moral universe of the sermon was largely a fixed, judgmental one. As a result, the sermons stressed their own usefulness. Their end was to motivate the audience to action. Agreement with the validity of the preacher's argument was not only insufficient; it was gratuitous. In the church, no one suspected that the preacher's arguments were false. This focus of the *ars praedicandi* sermon on the practical end had some significant technical consequences. *Historia*, in the terminology of Simon Alcok, was the most important of the many sermon *dilatationes*.

XUM

It was the most interesting and therefore the most effective of the tools of the fifteenth-century sermon. Frequent reliance on *historia* meant that devices of interpretation and explication would often be employed. Alcok's listing of such devices is detailed; and he explicitly advises the preacher to use *historia* in conjunction with other *dilatationes*. The two most likely interpretative devices for *historia* might be called *applicatio* and *correctio*. The first term, *applicatio*, is a popular one with modern scholars. It does not appear as a *dilatatio* category in any of the handbooks examined in the present study. *Applicatio* is often used in discussions of *exempla* and is best interpreted as a general word referring to such specific uses as Alcok's "*pertinet*," "*effectus*," and "*conclusio*." The term is cognate to its English equivalent; it refers to the drawing of a moral from a narrative.[3] Correction has been discussed in Chapter IV, p. 143.

Fifteenth-century preaching theory describes a sermon dependent upon Scriptural quotation for its impression of incontrovertible truth and upon *historia* for its ability to encourage the useful implementation of that truth. The successful employment of *historia* must have become a primary technical concern in the sermon theory and practice of the fifteenth century. In addition, a rhetorical focus on useful spiritual

---

[3] It is true that Alcok's sample uses of these devices refer to the dilation of authority. However, Alcok himself expands the use of *dilatationes* to the interpretation of *historia* in his treatment of that device: "Sed quasi pro maiore parte videtur, observandum quod quando aliqua historia prolixa vel brevis, vel aliqua autoritas scripture est introducenda in predicatione, debet aliqua oratio vel conclusio precedere que confirmanda, ostendenda, vel probanda est per talem historiam vel auctoritatem sequentem." (Alcok, p. 212.)

XUM

lessons would dictate that the narration of sermon historia be done in a special, preacherly manner. Such a sermonic voice would keep the attention of the congregation upon the moral intent of the story and not permit interest to settle upon the narrative itself. The sermonic voice might keep the historia useful by coloring the speech of evil characters, by stopping the progress of the narrative to moralize, or by allowing characters in the narrative to deliver speeches of doctrinal instruction. Or the preacher might so control the telling of a story with his basic instructive voice that the characters within the historia would not be fully represented. Rather, they might exist primarily within a frame of indirect discourse. The morality plays are historae or narratives with instructional intent. Because of this it is the sermon techniques for the narration of historiae which are most important for this study of the technical interrelationships of sermon theory and drama.

It was this widely recognized interface which first prompted G.R. Owst to explore the relations between morality play plots and characters and the exempla and other materia of the medieval sermon.[4] Other scholars have observed that narrative techniques are shared by medieval sermons. For example, Edgar Schell, discussing Castel of Perseverance, described the battle scene as the exchange of sermons by the vices and the virtues.[5] Theories that the plays contain sermonic prologues and

---

[4] Gerald R. Owst, Literature and the Pulpit. . . .

[5] Edgar T. Schell, "On the Imitation of Life's Pilgrimage in The Castel of Perseverance," Journal of English and Germanic Philology, 67 (1968), 245.

XUM

epilogues which deal with a middle *exemplum* section have been alluded to elsewhere. However, the most interesting theories of sermon-morality play interrelationship concern the notion of a sermonic voice operative in the plays as a basic voice or narrator for the events of the drama.

An early and influential study of the relationship of medieval drama and sermon was Marius Sepet's *Les Prophètes du Christ*. Sepet first examined the relation between the pseudo-Augustinian *Sermo contra Judaeos* and the *Ordo Prophetarum* (or *Processus Prophetarum*) liturgical dramas. In the fifth-century sermon he found elements of "enchained" dialogue which were dramatically realized in the eleventh- and twelfth-century Latin plays. Sepet traces these early sermon-drama relationships into the development of the medieval French *mystères*. The main vestige of the sermon origins of these religious plays is the presence of a "*voix de l'Église*."[6] E. Catherine Dunn has further pursued the nature of this voice and has suggested its presence in the English cycle plays. *La voix de l'Église* is a basic voice present throughout a given cycle which often finds full representation in the speeches of God and partial representation in such figures as the Patriarchs. It is a voice which is contemplative in nature. It reflects upon the events which have already transpired in the plays, draws attention to the prefigurative, typological principles which link the individual plays of the

---

[6] Maurius Sepet, *Les Prophètes du Christ* (Paris: Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartres, 1867-77), pp. 9-10, 103-111.

XUM

cycles, and serves a summarizing and emphasizing purpose in the plays. Such a voice does not have any one character fully representative of its views of the play's events or of its function in those events. Rather, through the course of a cycle various speakers, either within the dramatic limits of their character or sometimes in violation of those limits, will assume aspects of the basic *voix de l'Église*.[7] In a similar vein, V. A. Kolve has suggested that the Expositor "and other such characters" control and direct the action in the cycle plays. These characters are not participants in the action of the drama but function as transition makers and enforcers of doctrine. They serve to distance the play from reality and represent the views of the dramatist and of God.[8]

Bernard Spivack is the only critic of the morality plays to suggest that these dramas have a voice analogous to the *voix de l'Église* or to the Expositor. Speaking of a "didactic intimacy" between play and audience, Spivack explains:

> In addition to prologue and epilogue . . . any moment of the plot can provide an opportunity for one or several of the good personae to exhort the audience to take note of what is happening on the stage and to profit from it . . . .

---

[7] E. Catherine Dunn, "Lyrical Form and the Prophetic Principle in the Towneley Plays," *Mediaeval Studies*, 23 (1961), 80-90; "The Prophetic Principle in the Towneley *Prima Pastorum*," in *Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honor of Helmut A. Hatzfeld* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1964), pp. 117-127; "The Literary Style of the Towneley Plays" *American Benedictine Review*, 20 (1969), 481-504.

[8] V. A. Kolve, *The Play Called Corpus Christi* (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1971), p. 27.

XUM

> But the technique of the pulpit and its reformatory effort in these plays go even further . . . every personification of evil is converted into a preacher of straight exhortation. Vice, not content with disclosing itself for what it is and vaunting its power and ubiquity, must also deliver serious remonstrances against itself.[9]

Such a voice, it should be apparent, lacks the contemplative attributes of the cycle play voice. It is instead an argumentative voice; it is a voice whose objective is to persuade the audience to correct its evil ways--hence the term used by the present writer, "sermonic voice."

Once it has been conceded that the morality plays are doctrinal or moral arguments (but not "embodied sermons")[10] sharing their ends with those of the medieval sermon, evidence for the presence of a sermonic voice is plentiful. The most straightforward example of such sermonizing occurs when characters, in imitation of a preacher, address the audience and make a moral or interpretative point. Examples generally occur in plays which are flanked by opening statements and epiolgues dealing with the application of the historia. These instances, while their intent is argumentative more than contemplative, are analogous to the role of the cycle plays' Expositors. There are purely good characters in the plays whose speech is also most often in this simple sermonic mode. On occasion, a good character will turn out of the drama and make a moral point for the benefit of the audience; such speech will be classed in the non-dramatic sermonic mode in the present essay. Sometimes the good characters address fellow characters and assume a dramatic aspect of sermonic speech. The most interesting uses of sermonic voice in the moralities occur when characters of bad or changing character assume the sermonic voice. There are instances where man, living uprightly, will address the audience in a preacherly manner. Similarly, he may remain within the confines of the drama and lecture his fellow players in a sermonic style. When man is sinning, or when the vices speak, the concerns of the basic sermonic voice often intrude in the subjecte which the characters discuss. Or, still more subtly, sermonic voice will influence their diction. The operation of the sermonic voice in the morality plays is directly analogous to that of the voice of the preacher in his sermon. It sets up the frame for the argument and its moral tone. It then develops the argument using _historias_. The crucial point is that the playwright-preacher does not deliver a prologue, open the curtain, and leave the audience to enjoy the show. Instead, he remains in his pulpit and tells us a story by means of actors and stage business. The plays repeatedly reveal the presence, not of an expositor, but of a narrator with very definite moral and doctrinal biases and a very instructive rhetorical end.

---

[9] Spivack, pp. 110-111.

[10] Arguments to the contrary regarding Castel of Perseverance have been advanced by Michael Kelley, pp. 14-27.

Examples of sermonic voice operating in a simple preaching frame are easily recognized. _Everyman_'s Messenger not only provides a salutation, summary, and audience exhortation comparable to sermon beginnings; he also uses the pronoun patterns typical of a preacherly voice. Although he begins with "I pray you" (l. 9), the Messenger soon shifts to the first person plural usage: "euery ma[n] . . ./ of our lyues and endynge shewes/ how transytory we be all daye" (ll. 4-6). By line ten Messenger is lecturing the audience in the "you" form: "Here shall you see how felawshyp . . . ." (l. 16). Doctor ends the play with a summary and a stern correction of the play's message. The speech commands the attention of the audience with a vocative and drives home the message with imperatives:

> This morall men may haue in mynde
> Ye herers take it of worth olde and yonge
> And forsake pryde for he deceyueth you in the ende . . . .
> (ll. 902-904)

__Castel__ __of__ __Perseverance__ lacks a clear opening address in this sermonic mode; but the concluding speech of God is addressed to Mankind and summarizes the play's events in a generalized manner. The secondary addressee of the speech is the audience. The scope of God's remarks exceeds the concerns of just-saved Man; despite his reference to all mankind as "they," the speech is clearly given to benefit the audience. The oblique address of this speech is given quaint confirmation when at line 3645 God seems to drop his mask:

> All men example here-at may take
>   To mayntein Þe goode and mendyn here mys.
>   Þus endyth oure gamys.
> To saue ȝou fro synnynge
> Evyr at Þe begynnynge
> Thynke on ȝoure last endynge!
>   Te Deum laudamus!
> (ll. 3643-3649)

The prosody changes at line 3645 and the generalizing and very awesome tone is discarded. The actor who played God repeats the drama's moral and addresses the audience more intimately.

XUM

The long dialogue-prologue of Wisdom has been discussed elsewhere (pp. 153-4). The play's moral conclusion, where Wisdom offers his nine points and Anima and the Three Mights offer supporting conclusions, is also an example of formal sermonic address.

Mankind uses the same pronoun modulation as Everyman in its opening speech. Mercy, who performs as a priest in this play, shows overtones of the preacher in his characterization. His opening speech begins in the first person plural, moves to an audience address, then to a command and ends with an authoritative "I" usage:

The very fownder and begynner of owr fyrst creacyon
Amonge ws synfull wrechys he oweth to be magnyfyede, ...
Owr obsequyouse seruyce to hym xulde be aplyede . . . .
["we" usage]
(ll. 1-2, 5)
O souerence, I beseche yow yowr condycyons to rectyfye . . . .
Þat ȝe may be partycypable of hys retribucyon.
[audience address]
(ll. 13, 16)
I haue be þe very mene for yowr restytucyon.
Mercy ys my name, þat mornyth for yowr offence . . . .
In goode werkys I awyse yow, souerence, to be perseuerante . . . .
O ȝe souerens þat sytt and ȝe brothern þat stonde ryght wppe,
Pryke not yowr felycytes in thyngys transytorye.
[audience commands, "I" usage]
(ll. 17-17, 25, 29-30)
I besech yow hertyly, haue þis premedytacyon.
[final "I" usage]
(l. 44)

At the end of the play Mercy stands alone on the stage and, in summarizing the play's events, urges the audience to apply the lesson they have just been taught:

Wyrschepyll sofereyns, I hawe do my propirte:
Mankynd ys deliueryd by my fauerall patrocynye . . . .
Serge ȝour condicyons wyth dew examinacion.
Thynke and remembyr þe world ys but a wanite, ...
(ll. 903-904, 908-909)

XUM

Good characters need not serve formal expository functions in the plays to speak in the sermonic voice. But when they use this voice in a dramatic context they do not give it continuous realization. The gist of their expression always has reference to the doing of good and forsaking of evil; but the intent of the speech is not always the instruction of the audience. Often a good character will engage in dramatic dialogue which, like the speech of God in *Castel*, is addressed primarily to a fellow character and only secondarily to the audience. Such speeches are good examples of the successful yoking of drama and sermon. This sermonic speech in the combined didactic and dramatic modes is spoken by God the Father in *Everyman* (ll. 22-63). Death's long opening speech in this play combines these two intentions with expository functions (ll. 72-84).

The best examples of sermonic speech by good characters occur in *Castel of Perseverance*. Good Angel, whose role in *Castel* fluctuates between that of a character involved in the dramatic action and that of an expositor, changes the mode of his sermonic speech in mid-passage:

> So mekyl þe werse, weleawoo,
> Þat euere good aungyl was ordeynyd þe.
> Þou art rewlyd aftyr þe fende þat is þi foo
> And noþynge certys aftyr me.
> Weleaway, wedyr may I goo?
> Man Doth me bleykyn blody ble.
> Hys swete sowle he wyl now slo.
> He schal wepe al hys game and gle
> At on dayes tyme.
> ȝe se wel all sothly in syth
> I am abowte boþe day and nyth
> To brynge hys sowle into blis bryth,
> And hymself wyl it brynge to pyne.
> (ll. 1260-1272)

In this soliloquy Good Angel addresses Man in tones of lament. In line 1263 he comments on the dramatic action but does not violate the decorum of the drama. It is appropriate that the angel should speak such lines at this point; it is convenient that the audience also receives moral instruction in the speech.

At line 1269 Good Angel breaks out of the dramatic context of the play and openly addresses the audience. This non-dramatic, didactic speech is used frequently in the moralities. Such discourse prompted Spivack to speak of the "didactic intimacy" of the plays.[11] Morality playwrights did not seem to be constrained by an imaginary fourth wall in the medieval stage. It has been suggested that the audiences stood in the playing area and that morality play troupes were equipped with marshals to shepherd the viewers out of the drama's way.[12] It may be argued that, under the circumstances, to pretend that the audience was not there would have been far more unnatural than the frank acknowledgement of the audience which the plays do practise. In any case, the interruption of the dramatic business of the play with didactic addresses to the audience must be regarded as a manifestation of sermonic voice.

Mankind and _Wisdom_ use dramatic and non-dramatic doctrinal speech as well. The Three Mights in _Wisdom_ often speak in dramatically suitable sermonic voices (e.g., ll. 381-392). Wisdom offers a good example of mixed voice modes in the speech where he recalls Mind from sin. He first calls to Mind and is rebuffed. Wisdom then turns out of the drama and addresses the audience. The speech ends addressing Mind again:

---

[11] Spivack, p. 113.

[12] Richard Southern, _The Medieval Theatre in the Round_ (London: Faber & Faber, 1957), p. 88.

Thus many on vnabylythe hym to grace.
They wyll not loke, but slumber and wynke.
Þey take not drede before þer face,
Howe horryble þer synnys stynke.
Wen they be on þe pyttys brynke,
Than xall þey trymbull and qwake for drede.
Yit Mynde, I sey, yow bethynke
In what perell ye be now! Take hede!

Se howe ye haue dysvyguryde yowr soule!
Beholde yowrselff; loke veryly in mynde!
(ll. 893-902)

Mercy mixes these speech styles in Mankind. When sinful Mankind sees Mercy approach he cowers. Mercy speaks to Man, then delivers an aside to the audience:

Aryse, my precyose redempt son! ȝe be to me full dere.
He ys so tymerouse, my semyth hys vytall spryt doth exspyre.
(ll. 811-812)

More often Mercy speaks to Man in an ambiguous voice. He uses the address, "Mankind," in contexts where it is unclear whether he is generalizing about the human race or addressing the play's protagonist:

Man onkynde, whereuer þou be! for all þis world was not
aprehensyble
To dyscharge þin orygynall offence, thraldam and captyuyte,
Tyll Godys own welbelouyde son was obedient and passyble.
Euery droppe of hys bloode was schede to purge þin iniquite.
I dyscomende and dysalow þin oftyn mutabylyte.
To euery creature þou art dyspectuose and odyble.
Why art þou so oncurtess, so inconsyderatt? Alasse, who ye me!
As þe fane þat turnyth wyth þe wynde, so þou art conuertyble.
(ll. 742-749)

In this instance, as in all others, the confusion is intentional. (*Everyman* also uses the device in the early speeches of Death and God, ll. 22-84.) The usage serves to fuse the homiletic and dramatic purposes of the play in a single speech. Similar instances of the double function of sermonic speech occur in *Everyman*. This drama, in a major departure from the practice of the Macro plays, uses little direct audience address in the body of the play. With one exception, the audience is spoken to only in *Everyman*'s prologue and epilogue. But the play does employ dramatic speech with a combined addressee. The instructive speech of Confession to Everyman is a good example of dramatically justified doctrinal discourse (ll. 554-572).

The speeches of the mankind figures in the morality plays show the most varied use of aspects of sermonic voice. In all plays Man appears in two spiritual states. He may be in innocence, grace, and a state of good living or he may be in sin and courting damnation. The variations in the prosody of Man's speech accord with the state of his soul. This dimension of Man's characterization has been discussed elsewhere (above, Ch. IV, pp. 172-8). Man is also characterized by the form or aspect of sermonic voice which his speech employs. In states of grace he will speak very much like a good character. He will use an overt sermonic voice. Most often his sermonizing occurs within a dramatic context:

> O Mercy, my suavius solas and synguler recreatory,
>   My predilect spesyall, ȝe are worthy to hawe my lowe;
> For wythowte deserte and menys supplicatorie
>   ȝe be compacient to my inexcusabyll reprowe.

XUM

A, yt swemyth my hert to thynk how onwysely I hawe wroght.
Tytiuillus, Þat goth invisibele, hyng hys nette before my eye
And by hys fantasticall visionys sediciusly sowght,
To New Gyse, Nowadayis, Nowght causyd me to obey.
(*Mankind*
ll. 871-878)

Soueren Lorde, I am bownde to the!
Wan I was nought Þou made me thus gloryus;
Wan I perysschede thorow synne Þou sauyde me;
Wen I was in grett perell Þou kept me, Cristus;
Wen I erryde Þou reducyde me, Jhesus;
Wen I was ignorant Þou tawt me truthe;
Wen I synnyde Þou corecte me thus;
Wen I was hewy Þou comfortede me by ruthe;

Wan I stonde in grace Þou holdyste me Þat tyde;
Wen I fall Þou reysyst me myghtyly;
Wen I go wyll Þou art my gyde;
Wen I cum Þou ressaywyste me most louynly.
Thou hast anoyntyde me with Þe oyll of mercy;
Thy benefyttys, Lorde, be innumberable;
Werfor lawde endeles to Þe I crye,
Recomendynge me to Þin endles powre durable.
(*Wisdom*, ll. 309-324)

Everyman at graveside comments on the desertions of Strength, Beauty, and Discretion:

He that trusteth in his strength
She hym deceyueth at the length
Bothe strength and beaute forsaketh me
Yet they promysed me fayr and louyngly. (ll. 827-830)

O, all thynge fayleth save god alone
Beaute strength and dyscrecyon
For whan deth bloweth his blast
They all renne fro me full fast. (ll. 841-844)

All Mankind characters are capable of direct sermonic address to the audience. Just before he climbs into the earth Everyman declares:

Methink, alas, that I must be gone
To make my rekenyng and my debts pay
For I se my tyme is nigh spent away.
Take example, all ye that thys do hear or se
How they that I loved best do forsake me
Except that good deeds that bydeth truly. (ll. 864-869)

XUM

The protagonist in *Mankind* identifies himself with the audience when he gives a speech of introduction:

> Of Þe erth and of Þe cley we haue owr propagacyon.
>   By Þe prouydens of Gode Þus be we deryvatt,
> To whos mercy I recomende Þis holl congrygacyon:
>   I hope onto hys blysse ye be all predestynatt.
>
> Euery man for hys degre I trust xall be partycypatt,
>   Yf we wyll mortyfye owr carnall condycyon
> Ande owr voluntarye dysyres, Þat euer be pervercyonatt,
>   To renunce Þem and yelde ws wnder Godys provycyon.
> (ll. 186-193)

Mankind's speech is sermonic exposition on the nature of man's existence. Only *Wisdom* prevents its Mankind characters (*Anima* and the Three Mights) from speaking to the audience.

In *Castel* Man addresses the audience in a sermonic manner when he is protected in the castle:

> Þat dynge Duke Þat deyed on rode
>   Þis day my sowle kepe and safe!
> Whanne Mankynd drawyth to goode
>   Beholde what enmys he schal haue!
> Þe Werld, Þe Deuyl, Þe Flesche arn wode;
>   To men Þei casten a careful kaue;
> Byttyr balys Þei brewyn on brode
>   Mankynd in wo to weltyr and waue,
>   Lordyngys, sothe to sey.
>   Þerfore iche man be war of Þis,
>   For whyl Mankynd clene is
>   Hys enmys schul temptyn hym to don amys
>   If Þei mown to be any wey.
>
> Omne gaudium existimate cum variis temptacionibus insideritis.
>
> Þerfore, lordys, beth now glad
>   Wyth elmesdede and orysoun
> For to don as Oure Lord Bad,
>   Styfly wythstonde ȝoure temptacyoun.
> Wyth Þis foul fende I am ner mad.
>   To batayle Þei buskyn hem bown.

> Certys I schuld be ouyrlad,
> But þat I am in þis castel town,
> Wyth synnys sore and smerte.
> Whoso wyl leuyn oute of dystresse
> And ledyn hys lyf in clennesse
> In Þis Castel of Vertu and of Goodnesse
> Hym muste haue hole hys hert.
> (11. 1995-2020)

In this speech Mankind even functions as a commentator on the play's action when he confesses the trouble the assaults of the vices have caused (1. 2012). It is most interesting that the *Castel* playwright rarely allows Man to speak in a purely dramatic sermonic voice. He is given several eloquent laments which begin as fine dramatic and didactic passages. Invariably the passages end with audience addresses which specifically apply the moral for the listeners. A good illustration of this practice is Man's last speech. He has been stung by Death, he has talked with Covetousness, and he has met his heir *Garcio*. This is the most crucial speech of the play because its final line enables Man's salvation. Nevertheless, Man stops in mid-lament and briefly lectures the audience:

> Now, alas, my lyf is lak.
> Bittyr balys I gynne to brewe.
> Certis a vers þat Dauid spak
> I þe sawter I fynde it trewe:
>
> Tesauriȝat et ignorat cui congregabit ea.
>
> Tresor, tresor, it hathe no tak;
> It is oþyr mens, olde and newe.
> Ow, ow, my good gothe al to wrak!
> Sore may Mankynd rewe.
> God kepe me fro dyspayr!
> Al my good, wythout fayle,
> I haue gadryd wyth gret trauayle,
> Þe Werld hathe ordeynyd of hys entayle
> I Wot Neuere Who to be myn eyr.

XUM

Now, good men, takythe example at me.
Do for ȝourself whyl ȝe han spase.
For many men þus seruyd be
þorwe þe werld in dyuerse place.
I bolne and bleyke in flody ble
And as a flour fadyth my face.
To helle I schal both fare and fle
But God me graunte of hys grace.
I deye certeynly.
Now my lyfe I haue lore.
My hert brekyth, I syhe sore.
A word may I speke no more.
I putte me in Goddys mercy.
(ll. 2982-3008)

To a modern viewer the overt *applicatio* in Man's death scene may be lugubrious. But interruptions of this sort are so frequent in the morality plays that the maintenance of a continuous character-audience rapport whose matter is the moral instruction to be gained from the performance must be an essential of the dramatic tradition.

Mankind characters assume another aspect of the sermonic voice when they are in sin. The techniques of this speech are also present in the vices. Clearly, homiletic address of the sort that Mankind offers in the death scene of *Castel* is too distant from the nature of the evil characters to be used successfully even on the medieval stage. The playwrights resort to more subtle sermonic devices. Occasionally a character will speak lines which are in character superficially. The speeches are double-edged, however; there is a clear sermonic intent present, as well. On other occasions basic sermonic voice will appear in the diction of the evil characters and of man-in-sin. The words seem anomalous in their contexts. Their purpose, like longer homiletic lines, is to cast a pall of grim irony over the activities and speech

XUM

of the evil players. The consequence of this distinctive speech pattern is a didactic, moral overtone which instantly invalidates the content of the speech of evil characters. This correction technique is directly analogous to the coloration which a narrator can easily give to conversation when he presents it as indirect discourse rather than as directly quoted speech.

Goods in *Everyman* speaks in a manner which is anomalous. Why should such a character reproach the hero for being too fond of wealth? Much more in accord with our expectations would be a speech still scornful of Everyman's folly, but nevertheless overjoyed at his downfall. Instead Goods tells the protagonist:

> That is to thy dampnacyo[n] without lesynge
> For my loue is contrary to the loue euerlastynge
> But yf thou had me loued moderately durynge
> As to the poore to gyue parte of me
> Than sholdest thou not in this dolour be
> Nor in this grete sorowe and care. (11. 429-434)
>
> Therfore to thy soule Good is a thefe
> For whan thou arte deed this is my gyse
> Another to deceyue in this same wyse
> As I haue done thee and all to his soules reprefe.
> (11. 447-450)

Only after these speeches does Goods rejoice at Man's folly. Lucifer's introduction in *Wisdom* is also an example of anomalous speech. While his first three stanzas are good representations of the learning and thought of a fallen angel, the fourth stanza begins to repeat the main point of the dialogue between Wisdom and *Anima* which has just transpired:

> Of Gode man ys Þe fygure,
> Hys symylytude, hys pyctowre,
> Gloryosest of ony creature
> Þat euer was wrought (11. 349-352)

Lucifer is antagonistic to Man because he is to replace him in heaven, not because Man is made in God's image. The praise of man is not a manifestation of jealousy; rather, it is the emergence of the sermonic voice. The intent of the speech is to further characterize Lucifer as an abhorrent arch-fiend.

The Three Mights in sin show even greater influence of sermonic voice in their speech. After they have assented to Lucifer's arguments the three characters express happiness with their new state. But the discussions center upon the virtues they have abandoned. In bidding farewell to conscience, perfection, and chastity the Three Mights remind the audience of the virtues which they have discarded. The joyful speeches ring hollow in consequence (ll. 552-573). The scheming and playing run on for more than 200 lines. Throughout this episode overtones of anxiety emerge in the speeches of the three characters. Understanding remarks, "To be fals, men report yt game" (l. 603). Will argues, "Thes thyngys be now so conversant,/ We seme yt no schame" (ll. 607-8). Later Will declares, "Ande I in lust my flesche to daunte./ No man dyspyes thes; þey be but game" (ll. 611-612). The use of the word "daunt" in this speech is a good example of sermonic intrusion in the diction of an evil character's speech. It is unnatural for an advocate of lust to observe that the sin daunts the flesh. It would be more likely that a truly sinful character would discuss some more positive aspect of lust.

Mankind's evil characters are trivial in comparison to those of the other moralities. The portrayal of the sinful characters is notable chiefly for its high level of interaction with the audience. Titivillus, for example, develops a slapstick relationship with the spectators. He reveals his plan to fell Mankind and then repeatedly urges the audience to be silent and not reveal the scheme to the hero. In consequence, the sermonic voice in *Mankind* is evidenced in the vices in a much less grave manner. About the best examples of sermonic voice in evil characters in this play are the rather comic and supposedly inadvertent uses of Christian idiom by Mischief. His exclamations and asseverations repeatedly call on God and the Virgin. The following speech is a comic inversion of a morality play lament typically given to Mankind:

> Alas, alasse, Þat euer I was wrought!
> Alasse Þe whyll, I wers Þen nought!
> Sythyn I was here, by hym Þat me bought,
>   I am wtterly ondon!
> I, Myscheff, was here at Þe begynnynge of Þe game
> Ande arguyde wyth Mercy, Gode gyff hym schame!
> He hath taught Mankynde, wyll I haue be vane,
>   To fyght manly ageyn hys fon. (ll. 413-420)

Throughout the play Mischief is truly distressed but his speech repeatedly mimics the speech of the good characters. Here the intrusion of sermonic voice serves to reduce rather than heighten the awesomeness of the evil character.

Sermonic voice is most fully developed and best modulated in *Castel of Perseverance*. The evil characters and sinful man frequently employ diction with ironic, moralistic overtones. Furthermore, evil figures often speak about the virtues and about the everlasting joy of which they are depriving Man. Rarely does a vice present an account of his sin in a manner which makes it all appealing. One wonders if they really believe in the merits of the evil they represent. Ire's presentation to Man is a succinct example of the loathsome posture the vices assume. This speech occurs in the opening stages of the play when Man meets and then accepts each of the seven sins:

> Be also wroth as þou were wode.
>   Make þe be dred, be dalys derne.
> Whoso þe wrethe, be fen or flode,
>   Loke þou be avengyd ȝerne.
> Be redy to spylle mans blod.
>   Loke þou hem fere, be feldys ferne.
> Alway, man, be ful of mod.
>   My lothly lawys loke þou lerne,
>   I rede, for any þynge.
>   Anon take venjaunce, man, I rede,
>   And þanne schal no man þe ouyrlede,
>   But of þe þey schul haue drede
>   And bowe to þi byddynge.   (ll. 1088-1100)

The drafting of these speeches must be attributed to the influence of sermonic invention. The vices are made patently abhorrent with specific references to their more severe manifestations (like murder) rather than to their less threatening realizations in simple social relations. Man's folly in embracing them is made more keen by supplementing these speeches with enthusiastic blasphemies and bad pledges on the hero's part. Man's reply to Wrath should be examined for this evidence (ll. 1101-1113). A very clear example of such sermonic speech by man-in-sin occurs earlier in the play, however. Man is making his first pledge to World. He explicitly repudiates most Christian virtues and hopes in these lines:

> ȝys, Werld, and þerto here myn honde
>   To forsake God and hys seruyse.
> To medys þou ȝeue me howse and londe
>   Þat I regne rychely at myn enprise.

XUM

So þat I fare wel be strete and stronde
Whyl I dwelle here in werldly wyse,
I recke neuere of heuene wonde
Nor of Jhesu, þat jentyl justyse.
Of my sowle I haue non rewthe.
What schulde I recknen of domysday
So þat I be ryche of gret aray?
I schal make mery whyl I may,
And þerto here my trewthe. (ll. 597-609)

The content and tone of the speech are utterly unrealistic. Any man making such a Faustian pledge would most likely look with great anticipation to the worldly pleasures he was about to collect. Mankind does that to a limited extent. But he also alludes to his damnation three times in the thirteen-line pledge. The last time he calls his Savior "Jhesu, þat jentyl justyse." The real addresses of such a pledge has to be a congregation listening to a narrator-preacher. Strict dramatic propriety is too severly violated for any other interpretation.

In some instances the intrusion of the sermonic voice is less disruptive. When Covetousness welcomes Man to the Bad Angel's company the speech is appropriate to the character and the stage situation:

Ow, Mankynde, blyssyd mote þou be!
I haue louyd þe derworthly many a day,
And so I wot wel þat þou dost me.
Cum up and se my ryche aray.
It were a gret poynte of pyte
But Coueytyse were to þi pay.
Sit up ryth here in þis se.
I schal þe lere of werldlys lay
þat fadyth as a flode.
Wyth good inow I schal þe store,
And ʒyt oure game is but lore
But þou coueyth mekyl more
þanne euere schal do þe goode.

XUM

Þou muste ȝyfe Þe to symonye,
Extorsion, and false asyse.
Helpe no man but Þou haue why.
Pay not Þi serwauntys here serwyse.
Þi neyborys loke Þou dystroye.
Tythe not on non wyse.
Here no begger Þou he crye;
And Þanne schalt Þou ful sone ryse.
And whanne Þou vsyste marchaundyse
Loke Þat Þou be sotel of sleytys,
And also swere al be deseytys,
Bye and sell be fals weytys,
For Þat is kynde coueytyse. (ll. 828-853)

There are insidious elements in Covetousness' address but they contribute to his characterization. His several references to the ephemeral nature of wealth and to the peril that Man is bringing to his soul give an ironic tone to the speech. Man overlooks these references but the audience cannot because the poet has placed most of the threats to man's soul in the memorable prosody of the "wheel" of Covetousness's stanzas. The tone of the speech is not disrupted by this irony because the playwright has early established that the sins were determined to damage Man's soul (ll. 192-195, 205-208, 261-265). Further, Covetousness is pretending to be utterly straightforward and logical in his proposals to Man. By frankly belittling "Þe grete curse" (l. 854) Covetousness brings an illusion of honesty and comprehensiveness to his persuasion of Man. This speech is one of the finer examples of a successful melding of dramatic and sermonic discourse in the morality plays.

One of the most curious evidences of sermonic voice in this play occurs just after Man's death. Bad Angel speaks to Soul. The end of this long speech expresses what would seem to be the natural sentiment for a figure whose goal in the play was to bring Man to hell:

XUM

To deuelys delle
I schal þe here to helle.
I wyl not dwelle.
Haue good day! I goo to helle. (ll. 3125-3128)

But the speech begins in a very different tone. It reproaches Man (now played by Soul) for the foolish course he followed with the sins. The speech does convey a cruel anticipation of Man's coming discomfort; but it explicitly notes that Man's worst step was taken when he forsook the Castel:

ȝa, why woldyst þou be coueytous
And drawe þe agayn to synne?
I schal þe brewe a byttyr ious;
In bolnynnge bondys þou schalt brenne.
In hye helle schal be þyne hous,
In pycke and ter to grone and grenne;
Þou schalt lye drenkelyd as a movs;
Þer may no man þerfro þe werne
For þat ilke wyll.
Þat day þe ladys þou forsoke
And to my counsel þou þe toke,
Þou were betyr anhangyn on hoke
Upon a jebet hyll. (ll. 3073-3085)

Whanne þou comyst to my neste,
Why woldyst þou, schrewe schalt neuere þe,
But in þi lyue don aftyr me?
And þi Good Aungyl tawth þe
Alwey to þe beste. (ll. 3103-3107)

Bad Angel's speech serves to focus the instructional intent of the play's earlier scenes. Like a judgmental narrator, Bad Angel tells us where Man went wrong.

Sermonic voice most often intrudes through irony in the diction of the evil characters. Hence Man blesses Wrath after his present action: "Wrathe, for þi councel hende,/ Haue þou Goddys blyssynge and myn" (ll. 1101-1102). Envy begins his presentation to Man with the words, "Envye

XUM

wyth Wrathe muste dryve/ To haunte Mankynde also" (ll. 1118-1119). The use of the verb "haunte" has the ominous, ironic overtones typical of the sermonic voice in this play. Another example of ironic speech with sermonic intent occurs at lines 484-485 where Lust remarks that Man will be welcome in his company because: "He is worthy to be a seruaunt here/ þat drawyth to synnys seuene." Later Folly declares, "Wyth ryche rentys I schal hym blynde . . ." (l. 557). Covetousness' temptation speeches in the *psychomachia* are rich with this irony. Covetousness uses a semi-vocative oath in his first address to Man:

> What deuyl schalt þou þer lenger lende
> Wyth grete penaunce in þat castel colde? (ll. 2431-2432)

He tells Man he is "þi best frende" (l. 2429). The speech ends ominously:

> We to schul togedyr pley,
> If þou wylt, a whyle. (ll. 2438-2439)

The tag "a whyle" is a discomfiting reminder of the brevity of Covetousness' pleasures. In his last scene with Man Covetousness leads the hero away from the Castel saying "Go we now knowe my castel cage" (l. 2703). He is bringing Man to a vicious parody of his "captivity" with the virtues. Covetousness then gives Man money saying, "Worldly wele schal be þi wage;/ More mucke þanne is þyne iwys . . ." (ll. 2705-2706). Mankind also unwittingly speaks in terms overlaid with sermonic irony. Most examples occur in the scene where Man first embraces each of the vices. In accepting Wrath Man declares, "Raþyr or I schulde bowe or bende/ I schuld be stekyd as a swyne/ Wyth a lothly launce" (ll. 1107-1109). Man then praises Sloth for "þyne vnþende charmys" (l. 1229). Earlier in the play Man does speak in ironic tones when he makes his first pledge to World:

In werldly wele my wytte I welde, . . .
In veynglorye I stonde styll. (ll. 742,745)

One phrase which has great ironic impact is repeated by Man and the evil characters throughout *Castel*. Using the same promise that Everyman's bad friends gave to him, *Castel*'s vices continually entice Man with pleasures which will last "till death." In Man's presence Lust and Folly promise World that they will protect Man:

VOLUPTAS . . . .
In lyckynge and lust
He schal rust
Tyl dethys dust
Do hym to day.

STULTICIA. And I, Folye,
Schal hyen hym hye
Tyl sum enmye
Hym ouyrgoo.
In worldys wyt
þat in Foly syt
I þynke ȝyt
Hys sowle to sloo. (ll. 635-646)

In the long scene where Man takes up each vice, Pride tells the hero, "Tyl dethys dynt þi body delfe/ Put holy þyn hert in Pride" (ll. 1069-1070). Lechery tells Man "þi nedys schal be þe better sped/ If þou ȝyf þe to fleschly folye/ Tyl deth þe down drepe" (ll. 1184-1186). In the final scenes with Covetousness the term "till death" becomes a refrain. Speaking of the money he has given Man, Covetousness declares:

Lene no man hereof, for no karke, . . .
Ne helpe þerwyth chyrche nor cote,
Tyl deth þi body delue. (ll. 2730, 2733-2734)

foolishly eloquent in his delivery. In short, they encourage the preacher to be an impeccable but unobtrusive speaker. In Alain of Lille's terse phrase," . . . praedicator debet captare benevolentiam auditorum a propria persona per humilitatem, et a rei quam proponit utilitate, dicendo, se iis proponere verbum Dei, ut fructum faciat in mentibus eorum . . . ut eorum animi informentur, et quod ipsi considerare non debent quis loquatur, sed quid" (cols. 113-114). The preacher was to focus the attention of the audience on the lesson and not on himself. In the preparation of sermons the preacher was instructed to keep the useful, applicable aspects of his speech uppermost in the sermon design. Most later sermon theorists were ultimately more interested in the effect of a sermon than in its structure. Such an interest even appears in the ars praedicandi fragment of Simon Alcok. This compatriot of the morality playwrights must have discussed so many dilatationes because he was more concerned with the demonstration of a sermon argument than with the ordering of the parts of the speech.

The morality plays share the practical focus of the sermons and they manage to teach a useful moral lesson by employing the voice of a preacher as narrator. The basic sermonic voice of the plays does not achieve direct dramatic representation within the historiae of the plays. Occasionally the speaker of a prologue or epilogue will perform part of the preacher's functions. But once the morality drama itself begins the sermonic voice functions somewhat in the manner of a storyteller. It will sometimes lend good characters its ethos and permit them to sermonize in mid-drama. On other occasions it will assert its

In grene gres tyl Þou be graue
Kepe sumwhat fore Þiselue. (11. 2737-2738)

Mankind assures his mentor, "Þer schal it ly tyl Þat I dye,/ It may be kepte Þer saue and sownde" (11. 2743-2744). Covetousness then tells Man, "'More and more' sey ȝyt, haue do,/ Tyl Þou be ded and drepyn dounn . . ." (11. 2758-2759); and Man concludes the interview remarking, "On Coveytyse is al my lay/ And schal tyl deth me ouyrthrow" (11. 2771-2772). Through simple repetition, "till death" serves to remind Castel's viewers of the brevity of sin's pleasures. In a two-word phrase the sermonic voice makes a crucial point most powerfully.

It is probably inevitable that the most fundamental realization of sermon theory in the dramatic techniques of the morality plays cannot be expressed in a simple quotation from the handbooks. Sermonic voice in the plays is probably a habit of expression borrowed from generations of practice in effective sermon writing. The presence of a basic, morally upright, instructive voice in the medieval sermon was a matter of course. There was never any question that the preacher would continue to assert his rhetorical presence in the narration of exempla or historiae. His very physical presence served to keep the congregation's attention on the pastoral intent of his speech. The preaching handbooks represent this fact of the medieval preaching tradition in several ways. The conduct books are concerned that the preacher be a moral exemplar for his congregation. These treatises and other less specialized handbooks all urge the preacher to be properly dressed and well-prepared to give his sermon. They caution him not to be overly dramatic or

XUM

presence by actually disrupting the flow of the drama. Elsewhere the narrator will put anomalous ironies into the speeches of the very players who are entertaining the congregation.

The presence of the voice of a preacher-narrator in the morality plays is unmistakable and it demands that the accuracy of the label "drama" be reconsidered for these works. In this regard, it is a telling point that modern readers of morality plays find Everyman the most successful work of the genre. Scholars who have studied the plays believe that Castel of Perseverance, not Everyman, is the best representative of the group. The arguments contained in this chapter amply demonstrate the conviction of the present writer that Castel is a more complete example of the principles of morality play structure. The modern preference for Everyman probably reflects the fact that this play lacks the strong and continuous presence of a basic sermonic voice. The voice is revealed only in Everyman's prologue and epilogue and in passages where an allegorical character is a natural conduit for the opinions of the basic voice. Sermonic voice, especially in the ironic mode, in evil characters is much less plentiful in this play.

Regardless of modern preferences, it must be remembered that all the morality plays were enacted for public audiences of the fifteenth century who apparently found them entertaining. They do employ dialogue and not all of the speeches in the plays reveal the influence of the sermonic voice. But it should not be concluded that J. Craig La Drière's classifications of voice structures must be expanded to allow for a fifth category. Instead, this critic's argument that the four classes of speech are points on a continuum of possible structures is a more workable view of this literary classification. The voice structure of the morality plays, in the present writer's view, is narrative (La Drière's category 3). We call the moralities dramas because of their written form and the historical fact that they were performed by several actors. But these works have adapted the voice structure of rhetorical argument and their basic voice is that of a preacher delivering a narrative.

Conclusion

It may be argued that the importance of a sermonic voice in the English morality plays far exceeds that of authority and contraries. However, this study was planned as an exploration of the relationships between preaching theory and the design of the medieval English moralities. The preaching manuals speak specifically of authority, occasionally of opposites, and not at all about sermonic voice. While the flower of the preceding critical analysis may be the development of a theory of sermonic voice in the plays, the stalk for that bloom must be the more sturdy and dull cases for the clear transfer of authority and contraries from the pulpit to the stage. This dissertation has attempted to avoid becoming a simple critical expedition into the moralities. Instead, it has tried to analyze and corroborate the frequently cited opinion that the plays are sermonic. And it began by seeking a norm for the term sermonic in documents contemporary to the plays, the artes praedicandi.

This study has two results. First, it offers some useful insights into the nature and design of the English morality plays. It proposes that the plays are rhetorical arguments meant to motivate their audiences to look to their own salvation. The plays are not dramatized sermons which put the form and matter of the pulpit on the stage. Indeed, they vary significantly in form from the medieval sermon; but they adapt many clearly identifiable techniques of the sermon to a dramatic realization of the pastoral end they share with preaching.

The second result of this study demonstrates a lack rather than offering a solution. At every turn this work has been hampered by insufficient information about the artes praedicandi. While the dissertation is complete within its design, in the larger context the work cries out for more (and more pertinent) evidence from the artes. The edited preaching manuals include only one work from fifteenth-century England. Library inventories indicate that there are at least ten more unpublished manuals contemporary to the plays. A study of these manuals, at least, is a necessary supplement to this work on the edited texts.

The second result underscores the fact that the dissertation could not be a definitive exploration of the relationship between the ars praedicandi and the English morality drama. Nor, without a separate study of some complexity, can this writer's interpretation of the preaching manuals go unchallenged. An important auxiliary study would be an examination of the relationship of the sermon manual and contemporary sermon practice. While it is likely that the manual writers attempted to codify rather than prescribe sermon practices, there is no study to corroborate this judgment. And it is probable that the sermons, rather than the manuals, were the most frequently studied repositories of preaching technique. However, since the sermon bibliography is even larger and more chaotic than the preaching manual bibliography, the writer began work with the artes.

Despite the drawbacks inherent in the project, this dissertation does make some contribution to the larger concerns of Medieval Studies and Medieval English Studies. It has been demonstrated that medieval literary-rhetorical theory does indeed have an informative relationship to the literature of the period. Scholars interested in medieval literary theory have devoted most of their attention to the _artes dictaminis_ and _grammaticae_. These works deal with the apt arrangement of words and offer little help to a critic looking for indigenous medieval literary norms. The _artes praedicandi_, with their focus on _inventio_ and _dispositio_, offer a fresh source for historians of medieval literary theory. I believe that this dissertation is the first study which examines sermon theory as a resource for understanding any aspect of medieval literary practice. As a first step it can at best hope to make some ambitious observations and then suggest many more avenues of similar exploration.

This work has offered historical, if not aesthetic, justification for several of the characteristics of morality drama which modern readers find distasteful or difficult to justify. It concludes that the dramatists consciously borrowed not only some techniques but also the basic voice of the sermon for their plays. The preacherliness of some characters and the didacticism of the moralities were not simply laid over a dramatic form; instead, these things are part of the essence of the morality play genre. It is likely that further study of the _ars praedicandi_ and the sermon (surely the most widely practised of all medieval literary forms), in conjunction with critical examination of other genres of medieval literature, will yield additional insights into medieval literary values.

XUM

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED

Alain of Lille. *Summa de Arte Praedicatoria*. Ed. D. Caroli de Wisch. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, 210. Paris: Migne, 1855, cols. 111-198.

Alcok, Simon. *De Modo Dividendi Thema pro Materia Sermonis Dilatanda*. Ed. Mary F. Boynton. "Simon Alcok on Expanding the Sermon." *Harvard Theological Review*, 34 (1941), 201-16.

Atkins, J.W.H. *English Literary Criticism: The Medieval Phase*. 1943; rpt. Gloucester, Mass.: P. Smith, 1961.

Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis*. Trans. Willard R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1953.

Bennett, Jacob. "The 'Castel of Perseverance': Redactions, Place, and Date." *Mediaeval Studies*, 24 (1962), 141-52.

Bevington, David. *From "Mankind" to Marlowe: Growth of Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1962.

Blake, N.F., ed. *Medieval English Prose*, Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern Univ. Press, 1972.

Bloomfield, Morton. *The Seven Deadly Sins*. East Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1952.

Borgsleben of Erfurt, Christian. *Ars Praedicandi Doct. Eximii Cristiani Borgeslebensis Erfordensis*. Ed. Georg Buchwald. *Franziskanische Studien*, 8 (1921), pp. 68-74.

Brooke, C.F. Tucker. *Tudor Drama*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., The Riverside Press, 1911.

Caplan, Harry. "Classical Rhetoric and the Medieval Theory of Preaching." *Classical Philology*, 28 (1933), 73-96.

________. *Medieval Artes Praedicandi: A Handlist*. 2 vols. Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, Nos. 24, 25. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1934, 1935.

Carver, J.E. "Sermon Literature; English Medieval." *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1967. XIII, 117.

Charland, Thomas-Marie. *Artes Praedicandi: Contribution á l'histoire de la rhetorique au moyen âge*. Publications de l'Institut d'Études Médiévales d'Ottawa, 7. Paris: J. Vrin, 1936.

_________ . "Les Auteurs d'artes praedicandi du XIII^e siècle." *Études d'Histoire Littéraire et Doctrinale du XIII^e Siècle*, première série. Paris: J. Vrin, 1932.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*. Ed. F.N. Robinson. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1957.

Clark, Donald Leman. "Rhetoric and the Literature of The English Middle Ages." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 45 (1959), 19-28.

Coogan, Philippa. *An Interpretation of the Moral Play "Mankind*." Washington, D.C.: Catholic Univ. Press, 1947.

Curtius, Ernst Robert. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Trans. Willard R. Trask. 1953; rpt. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

D'Alvergny, Marie-Therise. *Alain de Lille: Textes inédits*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1965.

Davy, Marie-Magdelaine. *Les Sermons universitaires Parisiens, 1230-1231*. Études Philosophie Médiévale, 15. Paris: J. Vrin, 1931.

Dunn, E. Catherine. "The Literary Style of the Towneley Plays." *American Benedictine Review*, 20 (1969), 481-504.

_________. "Lyrical Forms and the Prophetic Principle in the Towneley Plays." *Mediaeval Studies*, 23 (1961), 80-90.

_________. "The Prophetic Principle in the Towneley *Prima Pastorum*." *Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honor of Helmut A. Hatzfeld*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Univ. Press, 1964, 117-127.

Eccles, Mark, ed. *The Macro Plays*. E.E.T.S. No. 262. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1969.

Eliot, T.S. *Selected Essays*. London: Faber and Faber, 1951.

Everyman. Ed. A.C. Cawley. Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1961.

Everyman. Ed. W.W. Gregg. Louvain: Uystpruyst, 1904.

Fifield, Merle. "The Use of Doubling and 'Extras' in *Wisdom Who is Christ*." *Ball State Univ. Forum*, 6 (1965), 65-8.

Francesc Eiximenis. *Ars Praedicandi Populo*. Ed. Marti de Barcelona. "L'*Ars Praedicandi* de Francesc Eiximenis." *Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia*, 12 (1936), 301-40.

XUM

Gilson, Étienne. "Michel Menot et la technique du sermon médiévale." *Les Idees et les Lettres*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1932. Rpt. *Revue d'Histoire Franciscaine*, 2 (1925).

Gioia, L.L. "Bibliography of Editions and Translations in Progress." *Speculum*, 48 (1973), 189-205.

Guibert of Nogent. *Quo Ordine Sermo Fiere Debeat*. Ed. F. Lucas d'Achery. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, 156, cols. 21-32.

Habicht, Werner. *Studien zur Dramenform vor Shakespeare: Moralität, Interlude, romaneskes Drama*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1968.

Hatzfeld, Helmut. "La Littérature Flamboyante au XV^e Siécle." *Studi in onore di Carlo Pellegrini II*. Rome: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1963.

Hefele, Charles-Joseph and H. Leclercq. *Histoire des Conciles*. Paris: LeTouzey et Ané, 1913.

Henry of Hesse. *Tractatus Eximii Doctoris Henrici de Hassia de Arte Praedicandi Valde Utilis*. Ed. Harry Caplan. "'Henry of Hesse' on the Art of Preaching." PMLA, 48 (1933), 340-61.

Hugh of St. Victor. *De Institutione Novitiorum*. Ed. at Abbey of St. Victor. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, 176. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, cols. 925-52.

Humbert of Romans. *Treatise on Preaching*. Trans. Dominican Students, Province of St. Joseph. Ed. Walter M. Conlon. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1951.

Huizinga, Johan. *Waning of the Middle Ages*. 1949; rpt. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1954.

Jean of Galles. *Forma Praedicandi*. Ed. Woodburn O. Ross. "A Brief *Forma Praedicandi*." *Modern Philology*, 34 (1937), 337-344.

Kelley, Michael R. "Fifteenth Century Flamboyant Style and *The Castel of Perseverance*." *Comparative Drama*, 6 (1972), 14-27.

Kolve, V.A. *The Play Called Corpus Christi*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1971.

Koontz, Christian. "A Stylistic Analysis of the Morality Play 'Wisdom Who is Christ'." Diss. The Catholic University of America 1971.

XUM

Knowles, David. *The English Mystical Tradition*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961.

_________. *The English Mystics*. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, Ltd., 1927.

_________. *The Evolution of Medieval Thought*. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

La Drière, Craig. "Voice and Address." *Dictionary of World Literature*. Ed. Joseph T. Shipley. Totowa, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams and Co., 1966.

de Lage, Guy Raynaud. *Alain de Lille; Poete du XII^e siècle*. Montreal: Institut d'Études Médiévales Albert-le-Grand, 1951.

Lecoy de la Marche, Albert. *La Chaire française au moyen âge*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1886.

McCutchan, J.W. "Covetousness in *The Castel of Perseverance*." Univ. of Virginia Studies, No. 4. Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1951, pp. 175-91.

Martin of Cordova. *Ars Praedicandi*. Ed. Fernando Rubio. "'*Ars Praedicandi*' de Fray Martin de Cordoba." *La Ciudad de Dios*, 172 (1959), 327-48.

Miller, Joseph M., Michael H. Prosser, and Thomas W. Benson. *Readings in Medieval Rhetoric*. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1973.

Molloy, J.J. *A Theological Interpretation of the Moral Play, "Wisdom Who is Christ."* Washington, D.C.: Catholic Univ. Press, 1952.

Murphy, James J. *Medieval Rhetoric: A Select Bibliography*. Toronto: Univ. Toronto Press, 1971.

_________. "Modern Elements in Medieval Rhetoric." *Western Speech*, 28 (1964), 206-11.

_________. "Rhetoric in Fourteenth Century Oxford." *Medium Aevum*, 34 (1965), 1-20.

_________, ed. *Three Medieval Rhetorical Arts*. Berkeley: Univ. California Press, 1971.

Muscataine, Charles. *Chaucer and The French Tradition*. Berkeley: Univ. California Press, 1966.

Nitze, William A. "Sens et Matière dans les Oeuvres de Chrétien de Troyes." *Romania*, 44 (1915-1917), 14-36.

Oberman, Heiko. *The Harvest of Medieval Theology*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1967.

Owst, Gerald R. *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1933, 2nd ed. 1961.

________. *Preaching in Medieval England: An Introduction to Sermon Manuscripts of the Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1926.

Pseudo-Aquinas. *A Brief Religious Tract on the Art and True Method of Preaching*. Trans. Harry Caplan. "A Late Medieval Tractate on Preaching." *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of J. A. Winans*. Ed. A.M. Drummond. New York: Century Co., 1925, pp. 61-90.

Pseudo-Bonaventure. *Ars Concionandi*. Ed. Quaracchi Brothers. *S. Bonaventura Opera Omnia*, 9. Rome: Quaracchi, 1882-1902, pp. 8-21.

Robert of Basevorn. *Forma Praedicandi*. Ed. T.-M. Charland. *Artes Praedicandi*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1936.

Roberts, Morris. "A Note on the Sources of the English Morality Play." Univ. Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 18. Madison: Univ. Wisconsin Press, 1923, pp. 100-17.

Roth, Dorothea. *Die mittelalterliche Predigttheorie und das Manuale Curatorum des Johann Ulrich Surgant*. Basler Beiträge zur Geschichtswissenschaft, 58. Basel: Helbrin and Lichtenhan, 1956.

Schell, Edgar T. "On the Imitation of Life's Pilgrimage in *The Castel of Perseverance*." JEGP, 67 (1968), 235-48.

Schell, Edgar T. and J. D. Shuchter, eds. *English Morality Plays and Interludes*. N.Y.: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Schirmer, Walter. "The Importance of the Fifteenth Century for the Study of the English Renaissance with Special Reference to Lydgate." *English Studies Today*. Ed. Charles Wrenn. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1951.

Shoeck, Richard. "On Rhetoric in Fourteenth Century Oxford." *Mediaeval Studies*, 30 (1968), 214-225.

Sepet, Maurius. *Les Prophètes du Christ*. Paris: Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartres, 1867-77.

Smalley, Beryl. English Friars and Antiquity in The Early Fourteenth Century. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1960.

_________. "Thomas Waleys, O.P." Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum, 24 (1954), 50-107.

Southern, Richard. The Medieval Theatre in the Round. London: Faber and Faber, 1957.

Spearing, A.C. Criticism and Medieval Poetry. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1964.

Spiveck, Bernard. Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil. N.Y.: Columbia Univ. Press, 1958.

Thomas of Todi. Ars Sermoniciandi ac etiam Collationes Faciendi. Trans. J. Miller, et al. Readings in Medieval Rhetoric. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1973.

VanLaan, Thomas. "Everyman: A Structural Analysis." PMLA, 78 (1963), 465-75.

Waleys, Thomas. De Modo Componendi Sermones. Ed. T.-M. Charland. Artes Praedicandi. Paris: J. Vrin, 1936.

Wertz, Dorothy. "The Theology of Nominalism in the English Morality Plays." Harvard Theological Review, 62 (1969), 371-4.

Wharey, J. B. "Bunyan's Holy War and the Conflict-Type of Morality Play." Modern Language Notes, 34 (1919), 65-73.

William of Auvergne. De Faciebus Mundi. Ed. A. de Poorter. Revue Néoscholastique de Philosophie, 25 (1923), 192-209.

XUM